



Medway Council Local Development Framework

Rochester Airport Masterplan

Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating SEA)

July 2013

enfusion



Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating SEA) - Rochester Airport Masterplan

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------|
| <i>date:</i> | Draft 28 June 2013 Final 18 July 2013 | |
| <i>prepared for:</i> | Medway Council | |
| <i>prepared by:</i> | Alastair Peattie | Enfusion |
| <i>quality assurance:</i> | Barbara Carroll | Enfusion |

enfusion

environmental planning and management for sustainability



Treenwood House
Rowden Lane
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2AU
t: 01225 867112
www.enfusion.co.uk

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| Rochester Airport Masterplan | 1 |
| 2. Baseline Characteristics | 2 |
| Evolution of the Baseline without the implementation of the Masterplan | 2 |
| 3. Method | 4 |
| 4. Appraisal Findings | 6 |
| Cumulative Effects | 7 |
| 5. Monitoring | 9 |
| 6. Summary | 12 |

APPENDICES

Appendix I: SA of Rochester Airport Masterplan

1. Introduction

Purpose of the SA and the SA Report

- 1.1 The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development through the integration of environmental, social and economic considerations in the preparation of Local Plans. There is no mandatory requirement for the SA of masterplans or Supplementary Planning Documents; however, the Council felt that it would be appropriate to undertake a SA for the Rochester Airport Masterplan to ensure that the key sustainability issues for the District, identified through the SA process for the Medway Core Strategy, have been considered and addressed through lower level planning documents.
- 1.2 The SA process involves the consideration at a strategic level of the effects of the plan on environmental, social and economic conditions. A more detailed assessment of environmental impacts is carried out at the planning application stage, which is referred to in this document as project level assessments.

Rochester Airport Masterplan

- 1.3 Medway Council intends to adopt the Rochester Airport Masterplan as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This is to provide guidance on the development of the site which can be used in assessing planning applications. The formal adoption of the masterplan as a SPD is dependent upon the approval of the overarching planning policy for Medway. The Core Strategy is currently at draft stage. In the absence of an adopted Core Strategy, the masterplan will still have weight as a material consideration in planning decisions. The Council is consulting widely on the draft masterplan and will take comments received into account in producing the final version of the plan. The Council intends to adopt the masterplan as part of its policy framework.
- 1.4 The purpose of the masterplan is to provide clear guidance on Medway Council's aspirations for the future of the area, setting out parameters for the type of development that will be encouraged and supported. The document provides guidance on the principles of development, including land uses, access and building heights. The masterplan is a long term document so does not set out the specific details of the design of development or where it will be located.
- 1.5 The masterplan sets out a series of design framework plans that set out key parameters for future development; these include land use, access, building heights and urban design. It also provides design guidance for buildings and landscape. The framework plans and the design guidance will be used to inform future detailed designs for each part of the overall masterplan.
- 1.6 This SA Report documents the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment processes for Medway Council's Rochester Airport Masterplan.

2. Baseline Characteristics

- 2.1 The masterplan area is located approximately 2 miles to the south of Chatham and Rochester, close to the M2 motorway. Two main roads bound the plan area, the A229 Maidstone Road to the east and the B2097 Rochester Road to the west. The majority of the existing pedestrian and cycling facilities are found to the east of the airport with limited facilities in the vicinity of the B2097. The plan area is served by a number of bus routes; primarily service 101 which runs via the A229 to Maidstone in one direction and Chatham and Gillingham in the other direction.
- 2.2 The core business of the airport is currently the leisure flyer, along with helicopter and air taxi uses. At present there are no restrictions on the number of flights at the airport and it currently handles approximately 35,000 aircraft movements per year. The site was a major strategic target in WW2 and was bombed three times and there is no information to indicate specific risk of any unexploded bombs. The site is recorded as having been mined with pipe mines, designed to deny the runways in the event of invasion, which have been reported to be removed. There is generally a higher risk of contamination in areas of WW2 usage, with the potential for Asbestos and low level Radium 226 contamination.
- 2.3 There is no designated biodiversity, ancient woodland or rare plant species within the masterplan area. There is no designated heritage within the masterplan area; however, there is an adjacent Roman Road which suggests that the site may require further investigation. There are also 19th Century fortifications that cross the northern end of the runway O2R. Fort Horsted Scheduled Monument is approximately 160 m from the masterplan area to the north east.
- 2.4 The site is not covered by any landscape designations; however, local people have indicated that the open views from the residential area across the airport are a valued local resource. There are a number of trees within Woolmans Wood Caravan Park that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). The site lies within an Outer Protection Zone 2 and Source Catchment Protection Zone. It also lies on a Principal Bedrock Aquifer which may support water supply/and or river base flow on a strategic scale. There do not appear to be any significant air quality issues within the site and it is not within any Flood Zones.

What would be the situation if there were no masterplan?

- 2.5 Development can still go ahead if the masterplan was not implemented; however, there would be no clear policies to provide guidance on the principles of development within the area, including land uses, access and building heights. This would be unlikely to have a significant effect on the evolution of the current baseline conditions as higher level planning policies would still apply; these seek to protect heritage and minimise impacts on the environment, landscape, traffic and health from development. However, without a comprehensive set of policies to provide guidance on the principles

of development specific to Rochester Airport it is likely that proposed development will be less co-ordinated and less likely to address the specific issues for the area and therefore provide less economic and social benefits to the local area and wider Borough.

3. Method

- 3.1 The appraisal was undertaken using professional judgement, supported by the baseline information contained in the SA Scoping Report for the Core Strategy¹ and additional information sources available, such as the evidence base for the Core Strategy. For consistency, the SA Framework developed for the SA of the Core Strategy, presented below, has been used in this SA.

Table 3.1: The SA Framework

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 Environment | Conserve and enhance the diversity and abundance of habitats and species |
| 2 Air | Reduce air pollution and improve air quality, including reduction of greenhouse gas emissions |
| 3 Water | Maintain and improve quality of ground and surface waters and security of supply |
| 4 Flooding | Reduce risk of flooding and ensure flood resilience of buildings and minimise the effect on public services and infrastructure |
| 5 Ecological Footprint | Reduce ecological footprint through prudent use of natural resources, reduction in waste and use of sustainable waste management practices |
| 6 Housing | Provide opportunity for everyone to live in a decent, sustainably constructed, affordable home suitable to their needs |
| 7 Previously developed Land | Maximise land use efficiency through appropriate use of previously developed land and existing buildings |
| 8 Health | Improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce health inequalities |
| 9 Poverty/ Social Exclusion | Reduce inequalities in poverty and social exclusion |
| 10 Crime | Reduce crime and the perception of crime |
| 11 Accessibility | Improve accessibility to key services and facilities (inc. countryside, leisure/recreation and historic environment) |
| 12 Material assets, heritage and culture | Conserve and enhance historic buildings, archaeological site and culturally important features and increase engagement by all sections of community |
| 13 Renewable energy | Increase energy efficiency; the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and the diversity and security of energy supplies |
| 14 Transport | Reduce traffic and congestion by reducing need to travel and improving travel choice |
| 15 Education and workforce | Raise educational achievements through developing opportunities to acquire skills, to develop and maintain workforce |
| 16 Employment | Support and improve employment and economic competitiveness in town centres and deprived areas |

¹

<http://www.medway.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/developmentplan/localdevelopmentframework/environmentalappraisals.aspx>

- 3.2 The definitions used to categorise the effects identified in the appraisal are explained in the following key, which is the same key that was used for the SA of the Core Strategy:

Table 3.2: SA Key

| | |
|---|---|
| ✓ | Significant benefits |
| + | Potentially some benefits |
| 0 | No effect; benefits/harm will be balanced |
| - | Potentially some negative effects |
| x | Not compatible |

4. Appraisal Findings

- 4.1 The masterplan was subject to appraisal against the full SA Framework in June 2013. A summary of the results of this appraisal is provided below, with the detailed working matrix provided in Appendix I.

Table 4.1: Appraisal Summary

| SA Objectives | | Rochester Airport Masterplan | |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Conserve and enhance the diversity and abundance of habitats and species | 0 | |
| 2 | Reduce air pollution and improve air quality, including reduction of greenhouse gas emissions | - | |
| 3 | Maintain and improve quality of ground and surface waters and security of supply | - | |
| 4 | Reduce risk of flooding and ensure flood resilience of buildings and minimise the effect on public services and infrastructure | 0 | |
| 5 | Reduce ecological footprint through prudent use of natural resources, reduction in waste and use of sustainable waste management practices | 0 | |
| 6 | Provide opportunity for everyone to live in a decent, sustainably constructed, affordable home suitable to their needs | 0 | |
| 7 | Maximise land use efficiency through appropriate use of previously developed land and existing buildings | + | |
| 8 | Improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce health inequalities | - | + |
| 9 | Reduce inequalities in poverty and social exclusion | + | |
| 10 | Reduce crime and the perception of crime | 0 | |
| 11 | Improve accessibility to key services and facilities (inc. countryside, leisure/recreation and historic environment) | + | |
| 12 | Conserve and enhance historic buildings, archaeological site and culturally important features and increase engagement by all sections of community | - | + |
| 13 | Increase energy efficiency; the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and the diversity and security of energy supplies | + | |
| 14 | Reduce traffic and congestion by reducing need to travel and improving travel choice | - | + |
| 15 | Raise educational achievements through developing opportunities to acquire skills, to develop and maintain workforce | 0 | |
| 16 | Support and improve employment and economic competitiveness in town centres and deprived areas | + | |

- 4.2 Overall, the findings of the SA suggest that the emerging masterplan will positively progress the majority of SA objectives. Permitting the development of employment uses will have long term positive effects on the economy and indirect positive effects on SA objectives relating to health and poverty and social exclusion. Long term positive effects were identified for the efficient use of land through permitting development on previously developed land as well as accessibility as access to the airport will be improved. There is the potential for improvements to walking and cycling routes as well as bus services, which could have long term positive effects on health, accessibility and transport. Improved accessibility to the airport and therefore the Medway Aircraft Preservation Society also has the potential for long term indirect positive effects on heritage.
- 4.3 The negative effects identified primarily relate to potential impacts during construction of development in the short term, on air quality, water, health and transport. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to address the negative effects and ensure that any residual negative effects will be minor. Mitigation might include the appropriate phasing of development and/or the submission of a construction management plan, transport assessment or travel plan with any proposal.
- 4.4 The SA also identified that there is the potential for negative effects on health as a result of unexploded ordnance and possible ground contamination at the site. Further studies and mitigation will be required if it is determined that this is an issue. The potential for short to long term negative effects on heritage was also identified as a Roman Road lies adjacent to the site and there are also 19th Century fortifications that cross the northern end of the runway O2R. Further studies at the project level will be required to determine if there is archaeology present on the site.
- 4.5 The SA recommends that any proposal for development should seek to maximise opportunities for biodiversity and energy efficiency savings as well as minimise impacts on the water environment (including surface water run-off and groundwater quality) and minimise the amount of waste generated during construction.

Cumulative Effects

- 4.6 The SEA Directive² requires consideration of the overall effects of the implementation of the plan, including the secondary, synergistic and cumulative effects of the effects of implementing the plan. This may include incremental effects that can have a small effect individually, but can accrue to have significant environmental effects.
- 4.7 Alone the masterplan is unlikely to have significant negative effects; however, it has the potential to contribute to increased atmospheric pollution, through increased surface and airborne traffic, and reduced water quality as a result of development proposed across the Borough and in through the Core Strategy and other plans and programmes, and in neighbouring areas. It is

² EU Directive 2001/42/EC

considered that suitable mitigation is available to ensure that any development within the masterplan area will not have significant adverse effects on the environment.

- 4.8 There is also the potential for a positive cumulative effect with other plans and programmes, such as the Core Strategy, through improved access to employment and leisure facilities as well as improvements to walking and cycling routes.

5. Monitoring

- 5.1 The aim of SA monitoring is to set a framework to show whether progress is being made towards sustainable development throughout the plan period. Monitoring arrangements should be designed to:
- highlight significant effects;
 - highlight effects which differ from those that were predicted; and
 - provide a useful source of baseline information for the future.
- 5.2 Local planning authorities are required to produce Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR) including indicators and targets against which the progress of the Local Plan can be measured. There is also a requirement to monitor the predictions made in the SA and Government advises Councils to prepare a Monitoring Strategy that incorporates the needs of the Local Plan and the SA. The SA Report (Dec 2011) for the Submission Draft Core Strategy set out a list of proposed indicators and targets to be incorporated into the AMR as considered appropriate by Council. The indicators and targets suggested for the SA monitoring of the Core Strategy in Table 5.1 are considered appropriate for the monitoring of the Rochester Airport Masterplan, with additional specific suggestions underlined and in red text.

Table 5.1: Potential Indicators

| | SA Objective | Framework Indicators |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Conserve and enhance the diversity and abundance of habitats and species | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent and condition of key habitats • Condition of SSSIs • Reported levels of damage to designated sites • Achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan targets • Number/area of Local Nature Reserves • Population of wild birds and farmland birds • Area of land covered by agri-environment schemes |
| 2 | Reduce air pollution and improve air quality, including reduction of greenhouse gas emissions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement of Emission Limit Values • Population living in Air Quality Management Areas • Number of days of air pollution exceedances • Emission of greenhouse gases from energy consumption, transport, and land and sea waste management • <u>Number of flights per year</u> |
| 3 | Maintain an improve quality of ground water and surface waters and security of supply | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality (biology and chemistry) of rivers, canals and freshwater bodies • Rivers of good or fair chemical and biological water quality • Compliance with EC Bathing Waters Directive • Water use (by sector, including leakage) and availability • Per capita consumption of water • Incidents of major and significant water pollution |
| 4 | Reduce risk of flooding and ensure resilience of buildings and minimise the effect on public services and infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properties at risk from flooding • Number of additional houses where flood risk has been reduced • New development with sustainable drainage installed |
| 5 | Reduce ecological | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste disposal in landfill. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | footprint through prudent use of natural resources, reduction in waste management and sustainable waste management practices | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of the total tonnage of all types of waste that has been recycled; composted; used to recover heat, power and other energy solutions; and land filled Number of new buildings reaching Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or above by 2013. |
| 6 | Provide opportunity for everyone to live in a decent, sustainably constructed, affordable home suitable to their needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of new and retrofit homes reaching Sustainable Homes Level 4 or above Housing completions compared with regional guidance. Affordable homes within the total housing stock. Homelessness. Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings. |
| 7 | Maximise land use efficiency through appropriate use of previously developed land and existing buildings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing density Percentage of development on previously developed land |
| 8 | Improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce health inequalities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Death rates from circulatory disease, cancer, and accidents, and suicide. Infant mortality rates. Conceptions among girls under 18. Life expectancy. Obesity Number of flights per year |
| 9 | Reduce inequalities in poverty and social exclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of children under 16 who live in low-income households. Percentage of population of working age who are claiming key benefits. Number of households in fuel poverty Proportion of population who live in wards that rank within the most deprived 10% and/or 25% of wards in the country. Access to services for disabled people |
| 10 | Reduce crime and the perception of crime | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recorded crimes per 1,000 population Fear of crime surveys Number of transport accidents Level of domestic burglaries, violent offences and vehicle crimes per 1,000 population |
| 11 | Improve accessibility to key services and facilities (inc. countryside, leisure/recreation and historic environment) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of development within 10 minutes or 500m walk of a frequent bus route/rail service. Access to services for disabled people Distance to nearest leisure or cultural facility Percentage of land designated for particular quality or amenity value, including publicly accessible land and greenways. Proportion of population within 200m of parks and open space The proportion of Medway residents meeting the Accessible Greenspace Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - live no further than 300m away from nearest area of natural green space of 2ha in size |

| | | |
|-----------|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at least one accessible 20ha site within 2km of home - one accessible 100ha site within 5km of home - one accessible 500ha site within 10km of home • Participation in sports, outdoor and volunteer activities |
| 12 | Conserve and enhance historic buildings, archaeological sites and culturally important features and increase engagement by all sections of community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of Listed Buildings and archaeological sites 'at risk.' • Buildings of Grade I and Grade II* at risk of decay. • Additional listed building or conservation area designations per annum • Participation in Cultural activities • |
| 13 | Increase energy efficiency; the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and the diversity and security of energy supplies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity generated from renewable energy sources and CHP located in the area. • Energy consumption per building and per occupant. • CO² emissions. • Number of households in fuel poverty |
| 14 | Reduce traffic and congestion by reducing need to travel and improving travel choice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distances travelled per person per year by mode of transport. • Traffic volumes. • Growth in road traffic. • Average vehicle speeds. • Proportion of travel by car. • Investment in public transport, walking and cycling |
| 15 | Raise educational achievements through developing opportunities to acquire skills, to develop and maintain workforce | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of 19 year olds with Level 2 qualifications (% GCSEs A*-C or NVQ equivalent) • Percentage of population of working age qualified to NVQ Level 3 or equivalent. • Proportion of adults with above or below average literacy and numeracy skills. |
| 16 | Support and improve employment and economic competitiveness in town centres and deprived areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business start-ups net of closures. • Inward investment. • Social and community enterprises. • GVA per capita |

6. Summary

- 6.1 The SA of the Rochester Airport Masterplan has appraised the specific effects of the Plan, as well as the overall effect of the plan, including cumulative and incremental effects. Overall the SA has found that the masterplan provides a comprehensive set of policies that will help to guide development in the area, with long term positive effects for the economy and indirect positive effects on SA objectives relating to health and poverty and social exclusion.
- 6.2 The negative effects identified primarily relate to potential impacts during construction of development in the short term, on air quality, water, health and transport. It is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to address the negative effects and ensure that any residual negative effects will be minor. Further studies at the project level will be required to determine if there is archaeology, unexploded ordnance and/or ground contamination on the site.
- 6.3 The SA recommends that any proposal for development should seek to maximise opportunities for biodiversity and energy efficiency savings as well as minimise impacts on the water environment (including surface water run-off and groundwater quality) and minimise the amount of waste generated during construction.
- 6.4 This SA Report is available for comments alongside the Rochester Airport Masterplan for an eight week period commencing on 22 July and running to 20 September 2013. Copies of this document are available on the Council's website at www.medway.gov.uk/rochester. Copies are also available to view at the Council Offices at Gun Wharf, Medway Innovation Centre and Medway Council libraries.
- 6.5 All responses should be sent to:

Address: Development Policy and Engagement team
Regeneration, Community & Culture
Medway Council
Gun Wharf
Dock Road
Chatham
Kent ME4 4TR

Email: ldf@medway.gov.uk

APPENDIX I: SA of Rochester Airport Masterplan

Key:

| | |
|---|---|
| ✓ | Significant benefits |
| + | Potentially some benefits |
| 0 | No effect; benefits/harm will be balanced |
| - | Potentially some harm |
| x | Not compatible |

| Rochester Airport Masterplan | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| SA Objectives | | Assessment of Effects | Mitigation, Compensation, Residual Effects |
| | | Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short/medium/long term, permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic) | Is there potential to mitigate, or if necessary, compensate for significant adverse effects? What are the residual effects? |
| 1 | Conserve and enhance the diversity and abundance of habitats and species | There is no designated biodiversity within or adjacent to the Masterplan Area ³ ; therefore, there is unlikely to be any significant effects. If project level assessments identify any important local biodiversity then this should be protected and enhanced where possible. | 0 The design of any development within the Masterplan area should seek to maximise opportunities for biodiversity. Biodiversity by Design: http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/biodiversity-by-design.html |
| 2 | Reduce air pollution and improve air quality, including reduction of greenhouse gas emissions | Proposed development has the potential for a negative effect on air quality in the short term during construction (increased HGV traffic and dust). There is also likely to be an increase in surface and airborne traffic, which could potentially have long term negative effects on air quality. Information provided by Rochester Airport Limited (RAL), which is set out in the Consultation Feedback Analysis Report (June 2013), indicates that as a result of proposed development, there is the potential for the airport to be | - Negative effects in the short term can be mitigated through appropriate phasing and construction management plans. It is considered that any residual negative effects will be minor. Negative effects in the long term will be addressed through the requirement for any proposal to be accompanied by a transport assessment, to assess traffic flows and junction |

³ Magic Map. Available online: <http://www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk/>

| Rochester Airport Masterplan | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| SA Objectives | | Assessment of Effects | Mitigation, Compensation, Residual Effects |
| | | Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short/medium/long term, permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic) | Is there potential to mitigate, or if necessary, compensate for significant adverse effects? What are the residual effects? |
| | | busier than it currently is. However, if planning permission is granted for the airport improvements, it is likely that a restriction on the number of flights will be imposed. This should ensure that there are no significant impacts on air quality. | capacity, and a travel plan, to set out measures for reducing travel by private vehicle and encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport (public transport, car sharing, walking & cycling). There will also be full consideration of air quality and noise issues at the planning application stage. It is considered that any residual negative effects will be minor. |
| 3 | Maintain and improve quality of ground and surface waters and security of supply | The site lies within an Outer Protection Zone 2 and Source Catchment Protection Zone ⁴ . It also lies on a Principal Bedrock Aquifer which may support water supply/and or river base flow on a strategic scale. Potential for long term minor negative effects on the water environment through impacts on groundwater quality. | - Any proposals for development should seek to minimise impacts on the water environment, in particular groundwater quality. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be available at the project level to ensure that there are no adverse effects on the water environment, minor residual negative effects. |
| 4 | Reduce risk of flooding and ensure flood resilience of buildings and minimise the effect on public services and infrastructure | There is no risk of flooding on the site ⁵ ; therefore, it is unlikely that there will be any significant effects. | 0 Proposals for development should try to minimise impacts on surface water run-off and incorporate sustainable drainage systems where appropriate. |
| 5 | Reduce ecological footprint through prudent use of natural resources, reduction in waste and use of sustainable waste | There is the potential for any development to try and reduce their ecological footprint through the prudent use of natural resources. | 0 Any proposal for development should be accompanied by a site waste management plan to try and minimise waste generated during construction and should also make appropriate provision for the separation, storage and collection of waste materials during operation. |

⁴ Environment Agency - What's in your backyard? Available online: www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37793.aspx

⁵ Ibid.

| Rochester Airport Masterplan | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| SA Objectives | | Assessment of Effects | Mitigation, Compensation, Residual Effects | |
| | | Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short/medium/long term, permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic) | Is there potential to mitigate, or if necessary, compensate for significant adverse effects? What are the residual effects? | |
| | management practices | | | |
| 6 | Provide opportunity for everyone to live in a decent, sustainably constructed, affordable home suitable to their needs | No residential development is proposed, no significant effect identified. | 0 | |
| 7 | Maximise land use efficiency through appropriate use of previously developed land and existing buildings | Potential for a long term positive effect on this SA objective through the use of previously developed land. It considered unlikely that there will be significant effects on the landscape as the master plan provides design guidance for buildings and landscape. This includes the requirement for development to respond positively to views into the area as well as the provision of a green bund along the western boundary of the airport land to soften views towards the employment area from the east. | + | |
| 8 | Improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce health inequalities | Potential for an indirect positive effect through improved access to employment and improvements to the existing provisions for pedestrians and cyclists. There is also the potential for short term negative effects during construction as a result of increased traffic, noise and dust. This is most likely to affect the Woolmans Wood Caravan Park, Medway Innovation Centre and the existing industrial area which surrounds runway 16/34 (which includes BAE Systems). Information provided by Rochester Airport Limited (RAL), which is set out in the Consultation Feedback Analysis Report (June 2013), indicates that there is unlikely to be any significant effects on health (through noise or safety issues) as a result of the redevelopment of the airport. They indicate that there is the potential for less | - + | Negative effects in the short term can be mitigated through appropriate phasing and construction management plans. It is considered that any residual negative effects will be minor. Further investigations will be required to determine if there is any unexploded ordnance and ground contamination at the site. |

| Rochester Airport Masterplan | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| SA Objectives | | Assessment of Effects | | Mitigation, Compensation, Residual Effects | |
| | | Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short/medium/long term, permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic) | | Is there potential to mitigate, or if necessary, compensate for significant adverse effects? What are the residual effects? | |
| | | <p>noise with a paved runway compared to grass as aircraft will be able to accelerate more quickly and take off easier. This means that they will have climbed much higher before they pass over homes near the airport. A paved runway also has the potential improve safety as a grass runway is slippery when wet and can be boggy. The masterplan does not contain the detailed design for the airport; any proposals made by the airport will be part of a separate planning application.</p> <p>The site was a major strategic target in WW2 and was bombed three times and there is no information to indicate that there is specific risk of any unexploded bombs. The site is recorded as having been mined with pipe mines, designed to deny the runways in the event of invasion, which have been reported to be removed. There is generally higher risk of contamination in areas of WW2 usage, with the potential for Asbestos and low level Radium 226 contamination. Potential for short to long term negative effects on health.</p> | | | |
| 9 | Reduce inequalities in poverty and social exclusion | Potential for a long term minor positive effect through permitting the development of employment uses. | | + | |
| 10 | Reduce crime and the perception of crime | No significant effects identified. | | 0 | Proposals for development should take account of Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004). |
| 11 | Improve accessibility to key services and facilities (inc. countryside, | Potential for a long term minor positive effect on this SA objective as access to the airport will be improved, which is primarily used for leisure flights. | | + | |

| Rochester Airport Masterplan | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| SA Objectives | | Assessment of Effects | Mitigation, Compensation, Residual Effects |
| | | Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short/medium/long term, permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic) | Is there potential to mitigate, or if necessary, compensate for significant adverse effects? What are the residual effects? |
| | leisure/recreation and historic environment) | | |
| 12 | Conserve and enhance historic buildings, archaeological site and culturally important features and increase engagement by all sections of community | <p>There are no listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the site. Fort Horsted Scheduled Monument is less than 200m from the North East boundary of the Masterplan area; however, they are separated by existing industrial development and development is therefore unlikely to have a significant effect. There is a Roman Road adjacent to the site which suggests that further investigations will be required. There are also 19th Century fortifications that cross the northern end of the runway O2R. Depending on the findings of further studies there is the potential for short to long term negative effects on heritage.</p> <p>There is also the potential for long term minor positive effect on this SA objective through improved access and public/heritage facilities for Medway Aircraft Preservation Society.</p> | - + It is recommended that any proposal seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets and require mitigation is available to address potential negative effects. Further studies will be required to determine if there is archaeology present on the site. |
| 13 | Increase energy efficiency; the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources and the diversity and security of energy supplies | There is the potential for any proposal to incorporate energy efficiency measures and to meet some of their residual on-site energy requirements from renewable energy sources. Potential for a long term minor positive effect. | + Any proposal for new development should try and maximise energy efficiency savings through passive design and building fabric improvements. Larger developments (over 1,000 sq m) should try and meet some of their residual on-site energy requirements from decentralised, renewable energy sources. |
| 14 | Reduce traffic and congestion by reducing need to travel and | The masterplan permits development that has the potential to increase levels of traffic on the surrounding road network. There is also the potential for minor long | - + The Masterplan sets out a number of transport improvements as well as requires any proposal to be accompanied by a transport assessment, to |

| Rochester Airport Masterplan | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| SA Objectives | | Assessment of Effects | Mitigation, Compensation, Residual Effects | |
| | | Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short/medium/long term, permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic) | Is there potential to mitigate, or if necessary, compensate for significant adverse effects? What are the residual effects? | |
| | improving travel choice | term positive effects through improvements to walking and cycling routes The masterplan sets out a number of transport improvements as well as potential improvements to bus services. | | assess traffic flows and junction capacity, and a travel plan, to set out measures for reducing travel by private vehicle and encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport (public transport, car sharing, walking & cycling). It is considered that any residual negative effects will be minor. |
| 15 | Raise educational achievements through developing opportunities to acquire skills, to develop and maintain workforce | No significant effects identified. | 0 | |
| 16 | Support and improve employment and economic competitiveness in town centres and deprived areas | Potential for a long term positive effect through permitting the development of employment uses. | + | |