

BOUGHTON ALUPH & EASTWELL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Site Ref: BAE 01/7

Site Name:

Date Survey Completed:

Site Description:			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?		
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?		
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?		
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?		
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?		

<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?		
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the scale, character and quality of landscape/streetscapes and local settlement patterns?		
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?		
2.4	Would the development of the site impact the existing rural/urban boundary in the designated area?		
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*		
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*		
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?		
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*		
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?		
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?		

4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?		
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)		
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?		
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?		
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?		
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?		
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)		
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?		
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?		
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?		
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?		
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?		

<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?		
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?		
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?		
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?		
9.2	Does the local road network have suitable capacity to provide for the site?		
9.3	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?		
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?		
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?		
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*		
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?		
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)		
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?		

12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?		
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?		
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?		
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?		
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?		
<b>Conclusion:</b>			<b>Total:</b>

\* In accordance with the importance and weight encompassed in the NPPF, SA scoring could be overruled on sites that fall in the AONB, are in areas of highest flood risk, provide a substantial harm or total loss of a heritage asset or are found in a mineral safeguarding area.

## Sustainability Appraisal Site Assessment Pro forma

SCORE	Description	Illustrative Guidance for Biodiversity
2	Significant positive	Would have a significant and sustained positive impact
1	Positive	Would have a minor positive impact
0	None - Neutral Effect	Would not have any known effects.
-1	Negative	Would have a minor short term (direct or indirect) negative effects.
-2	Significant Negative	Would have a strong negative and sustained effect.

Objective	Site Assessment/ Screening Question (prompt questions)	COMMENTARY: Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	<p>Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat? Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect (direct or indirect) on a designated habitat because of the nature of development and proximity and sensitivities of the designated habitat. Are there opportunities for avoidance, mitigation or compensation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it avoid adverse impacts on European and UK designated habitat and or/Kent or UK BAP habitats and species?</li> <li>• Will it create new habitats and improve the incidence and diversity of species?</li> <li>• Will it avoid adverse impacts on protected European sites and/or UK BAP habitats and species?</li> <li>• Is appropriate provision made for timely replacement habitat of at least equivalent size and value where impacts cannot be avoided?</li> </ul>	Would have a significant and sustained positive impact on European or national designated sites and/or protected species it creates new habitat on site and/or leads to a long term increase in population of designated species.	2
		Would have a minor positive impact on European or national designated sites and/or protected species, it creates new habitat on site and/or leads to an increase in population of designated species.	1
		Would not have any known impacts, as site not within or near a internationally /nationally designated site.	0
		Would have a minor short-term (direct or indirect) negative impact on European or national designated sites through a minor increase in disturbance, partial habitat loss or minimal species loss.	-1
		Would have a strong negative impact on European or national designated sites and/or protected species, it causes long term decrease in populations of designated species, extensive habitat loss and disturbance.	-2
1.2	<p>Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it create new habitats and improve the incidence and diversity of species?</li> <li>• Will it avoid adverse impacts on Kent BAP habitats and species?</li> </ul>	Would have a significant and sustained positive impact on LWS and/or protected species it creates new habitat on site and/or leads to a long term increase in population of designated species.	2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Is appropriate provision made for replacement habitat of at least equivalent size and value where impacts cannot be avoided?</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Would have a minor positive impact on LWS and/or protected species it creates new habitat on site and/or leads to an increase in population of designated species.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Would not have any known impacts, as site not within or near a LWS.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Would have a minor short-term (direct or indirect) negative impact on LWS through a minor increase in disturbance, partial habitat loss or minimal species loss.</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Would have a strong negative impact on LWS and/or protected species, it causes long term decrease in populations of designated species, extensive habitat loss and disturbance.</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	Would have a minor positive impact on LWS and/or protected species it creates new habitat on site and/or leads to an increase in population of designated species.	1	Would not have any known impacts, as site not within or near a LWS.	0	Would have a minor short-term (direct or indirect) negative impact on LWS through a minor increase in disturbance, partial habitat loss or minimal species loss.	-1	Would have a strong negative impact on LWS and/or protected species, it causes long term decrease in populations of designated species, extensive habitat loss and disturbance.	-2
Would have a minor positive impact on LWS and/or protected species it creates new habitat on site and/or leads to an increase in population of designated species.	1									
Would not have any known impacts, as site not within or near a LWS.	0									
Would have a minor short-term (direct or indirect) negative impact on LWS through a minor increase in disturbance, partial habitat loss or minimal species loss.	-1									
Would have a strong negative impact on LWS and/or protected species, it causes long term decrease in populations of designated species, extensive habitat loss and disturbance.	-2									
1.3	<p>Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does the site contain TPOs?</li> <li>•Is it in or adjacent to Ancient Woodland?</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Site does not result in the loss of key components in the habitat network</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site will cause minor loss of key components in the habitat network, or is adjacent/near to ancient woodland</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site will cause the loss significant loss of key components in the habitat network. Or it affects Ancient Woodland</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	Site does not result in the loss of key components in the habitat network	0	Site will cause minor loss of key components in the habitat network, or is adjacent/near to ancient woodland	-1	Site will cause the loss significant loss of key components in the habitat network. Or it affects Ancient Woodland	-2		
Site does not result in the loss of key components in the habitat network	0									
Site will cause minor loss of key components in the habitat network, or is adjacent/near to ancient woodland	-1									
Site will cause the loss significant loss of key components in the habitat network. Or it affects Ancient Woodland	-2									
1.4	<p>Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will it enable managed access to natural areas?</li> <li>•Will it improve the green &amp; blue linkages between existing and/or proposed areas of semi natural habitat and species-rich areas? (check Kent Biodiversity Opportunity Areas)</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Site will improve linkages <b>and</b> enable managed access</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site will either improve linkages <b>or</b> will enable managed access</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	Site will improve linkages <b>and</b> enable managed access	2	Site will either improve linkages <b>or</b> will enable managed access	1	Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access	0		
Site will improve linkages <b>and</b> enable managed access	2									
Site will either improve linkages <b>or</b> will enable managed access	1									
Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access	0									
1.5	<p>Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjoining</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes within</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	No	0	Adjoining	-1	Yes within	-2		
No	0									
Adjoining	-1									
Yes within	-2									
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>										
2.1	<p>Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjoining/affect setting</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes within</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	No	0	Adjoining/affect setting	-1	Yes within	-2		
No	0									
Adjoining/affect setting	-1									
Yes within	-2									
2.2	<p>Could development of the site respond effectively to the scale, character and quality of landscape/streetscapes and settlement patterns? †</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Development of the site would have a significant positive impact on the landscape/streetscape setting</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Development of the site would have a minor positive impact on the landscape /streetscape setting</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Development of the site would have a significant positive impact on the landscape/streetscape setting	2	Development of the site would have a minor positive impact on the landscape /streetscape setting	1				
Development of the site would have a significant positive impact on the landscape/streetscape setting	2									
Development of the site would have a minor positive impact on the landscape /streetscape setting	1									

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Will the site's land use and design have an impact on the setting of the designated landscape area?</li> <li>•Will it enhance landscape/streetscape character?</li> <li>•Will it avoid adverse impacts on, and enhance, designated and non-designated landscape features?</li> </ul>	Development of the site would have no impact on the landscape/streetscape setting	0
		Development of the site would have a minor negative impact on the landscape/streetscape setting	-1
		Development of the site would have a significant negative impact on the landscape/streetscape setting	-2
2.3	<p>Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does it respond to and reinforce the topography of the area, view corridors and existing landscape features?</li> <li>•Will it avoid adverse impacts on visual amenity?</li> </ul>	There would be a positive impact	1
		No impact	0
		There would be a negative impact	-1
2.4	Would the development of the site impact the existing rural/urban boundary in the designated area? †	Yes	-2
		No	2
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a conservation area?	Not within or adjoining	1
		Adjoining	0
		within	-1
3.2	<p>Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or Registered Park/ Garden?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does it respect, and where possible enhance, the character and setting of historic and archaeological assets including listed buildings, registered parks and gardens and scheduled monuments?</li> </ul>	Site contains a listed building, scheduled monument or registered park or garden and has a significant positive impact on them.	2
		Site contains a listed building, scheduled monument or registered park or garden and has a minor negative impact on them.	1
		Does not contain a listed building, SM and is not in a CA or historic park or garden. Or has no impact on them.	0
		Site contains a listed building, scheduled monument or registered park or garden and has a minor negative impact on them.	-1
		Site contains a listed building, scheduled monument or registered park or garden and has a significant negative impact on them.	-2
3.2	<p>Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does it respect and enhance the character of conservation areas?</li> </ul>	Site will enhance the character and setting of Ashford's cultural assets	1
		Will not affect or not applicable	0
		Will negatively impact on the character and setting	-1



	•Will it help improve access to, and understanding of, historical and cultural assets?										
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>											
4.1	<p>Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?</p> <p>•Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure and /or promote enhanced flood storage capacity/measures?</p> <p>•Is the site at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p>See O:\Working Groups\Ashford Water Group\Ashford SFRA - first review\FINAL Ashford SFRA - July 2014 Please use Appendix B constraints table and Appendix C summary sheet to get information, and check this against the GIS map (link in same file).</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Promotes enhanced flood storage capacity measures</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not in flood zone</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In flood zone 2.</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In flood zone 2 and 3</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	Promotes enhanced flood storage capacity measures	1	Not in flood zone	0	In flood zone 2.	-1	In flood zone 2 and 3	-2	
Promotes enhanced flood storage capacity measures	1										
Not in flood zone	0										
In flood zone 2.	-1										
In flood zone 2 and 3	-2										
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Not affected or applicable</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>in 1 in 100 yr. flood zone</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In 1 in 30 yr. flood zone</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	Not affected or applicable	0	in 1 in 100 yr. flood zone	-1	In 1 in 30 yr. flood zone	-2			
Not affected or applicable	0										
in 1 in 100 yr. flood zone	-1										
In 1 in 30 yr. flood zone	-2										
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	Yes	1	No	0					
Yes	1										
No	0										
4.4	<p>Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?</p> <p>• Will it maintain and improve ground and/or surface water quality?</p> <p>• Will it help reduce water consumption?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Yes	0	No	1					
Yes	0										
No	1										
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>											
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>	Yes	1	No	0					
Yes	1										
No	0										
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>											
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Gain of facilities</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No impact on facilities</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loss of facilities</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> </table>	Gain of facilities	1	No impact on facilities	0	Loss of facilities	-1			
Gain of facilities	1										
No impact on facilities	0										
Loss of facilities	-1										
6.2	<p>Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?</p> <p>Measurement to be taken from centre of the site.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Less than 400m</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>400-800m</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>800-1.6km</td> <td>-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>More than 1.6km</td> <td>-2</td> </tr> </table>	Less than 400m	1	400-800m	0	800-1.6km	-1	More than 1.6km	-2	
Less than 400m	1										
400-800m	0										
800-1.6km	-1										
More than 1.6km	-2										

6.3	<p>Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve accessibility to GP facilities?</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search">http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search</a></p>	Less than 400m	1
		400-800m	0
		800-1.6km	-1
		More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	<p>Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?</p> <p><i>Measurement to be taken from centre of the site.</i></p>	Less than 400m	1
		400-800m	0
		800-1.6km	-1
		More than 1.6km	-2
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	<p>Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal Open Space, accessible by the Public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase accessibility to high quality, green open spaces?</li> </ul>	Less than 400m	1
		400-800m	0
		800-1.6km	-1
		More than 1.6km	-2
7.2	<p>Is the site located in close proximity to an equipped play area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it improve accessibility to play spaces?</li> </ul>	Less than 400m	1
		400-800m	0
		800-1.6km	-1
		More than 1.6km	-2
7.3	<p>Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?</p> <p><i>Measurement to be taken from centre of the site.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would it encourage residents to make healthier lifestyle choices by increasing accessibility to shops, services and health facilities by foot?</li> </ul>	Less than 400m	1
		400-800m	0
		800-1.6km	-1
		More than 1.6km	-2
7.4	<p>Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?</p>	Gain of strategic and/or local open space	1
		No loss or gain of open space	0
		Loss of strategic and/or local open space	-1
7.5	<p>Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• e.g. noise or light pollution?</li> </ul>	Not close to any	0
		Close to land use that could cause affect to health	-1
7.6	<p>Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?</p>	Yes	1
		No	0

Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
		No	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it encourage development in accessible locations that reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>• Will it create links between communities and the town/ district/ village centres?</li> </ul> Use Sustrans Website.	yes	1
		no	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent service? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it encourage the use of public transport?</li> </ul>	Yes	1
		No	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	Yes	-1
		No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•check the following website, using the nearest available postcode to the site: <a href="http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search">http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search</a></li> </ul>	Yes	1
		No	0
9.3	Does the local road network have suitable capacity to provide for the proposed development? †	Yes	2
		No	-2
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it bring contaminated land back into use?</li> <li>•Is the site greenfield but could increased densities?</li> </ul>	Site brings brownfield contaminated back into use	2
		Site brings brownfield or contaminated land back into use	1
		Site is a greenfield site but could achieve increased densities	0
		Site is greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	Yes	1
		No	0
Objective 11: Minerals, Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves? <a href="http://consult.kent.gov.uk/portal/mwcs/mwlp-submission">http://consult.kent.gov.uk/portal/mwcs/mwlp-submission</a>	No	0

		Yes	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS)? <a href="http://www.kentrigs.org.uk/">http://www.kentrigs.org.uk/</a>	Yes	-1
		No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3)	Not graded or grade 3	0
		In Grade 2	-1
		In Grade 1	-2
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it bring forward a range of employment and business uses/premises?</li> <li>• Will it improve the physical accessibility to jobs?</li> <li>• Would it help support rural businesses and/or generate local employment opportunities?</li> </ul>	Yes brings forward business units/ premises and generates significant employment	2
		Yes brings forward business units/premises or generates significant employment	1
		Has no impact on business unit/.premises provision and job generation	0
		Causes loss of business units/ premises or generates significant employment loss	-1
		Causes loss of business units/ premises and generates significant employment loss	-2
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does the site have access to broadband?	*Scoring below may change if it is possible to find out download speeds.	
		Yes	1
		No / Not known	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it bring forward educational/ learning institutions?</li> </ul>	Yes	1
		No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	Yes	1
		No	0
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should include nearest large village.</li> <li>• Does it promote a mix of uses which will help generate and maintain vitality in the town centre?</li> <li>• Does it help reinforce Ashford/Tenterden's role in the retail hierarchy?</li> </ul>	Yes	1
		No	0

13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1142 134 2033 170">Yes</td> <td data-bbox="2040 134 2136 170">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1142 170 2033 207">No/ not applicable</td> <td data-bbox="2040 170 2136 207">0</td> </tr> </table>		Yes	1	No/ not applicable	0
Yes	1						
No/ not applicable	0						
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services? • <i>This should include nearest large village.</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1142 213 2033 250">No</td> <td data-bbox="2040 213 2136 250">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1142 250 2033 287">Yes</td> <td data-bbox="2040 250 2136 287">-1</td> </tr> </table>		No	0	Yes	-1
No	0						
Yes	-1						
<b>Conclusion</b>							

† Parish-specific criteria developed from the results of the Neighbourhood Plan Survey 2016.