

R1987

Supplementary Statement to Session 13A. Land at Green Lane, Langley .

Issue (i) -Whether the alternative site would be suitable , sustainable and deliverable.

Qn13.1 Does the site have any relevant planning history ?

Details of the site have been submitted to the Council in response to its “Call for Sites” in a letter dated 7th March 2013. In addition to that, representations have been made in response to the draft local plan.

Qn13.2 What is the site’s policy status in the submitted Local Plan ?

It is not subject to any constraints as identified in the submitted Local Plan.

Qn13.3 What is the site’s policy status in any made or emerging neighbourhood plan

No draft of a Neighbourhood plan has been produced.

Qn13.4 Is the site greenfield or previously developed (brownfield)land according to the definition in the glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework ?

It is a greenfield site.

Qn13.5 What previous consideration by the Council has been given to the site’s development (eg inclusion in a Strategic Housing and Economic Development Land Availability Assessment (SHEDLAA) and does the representor have any comments on its conclusions ?

The site has reference HO2-175 in the Council’s SHEDLAA.

That assessment concluded that “This site is available for development and there are no abnormal costs or constraints identified with it. It is however, poorly related to the village, which itself has limited services. The site’s development also has the potential to have an adverse highway impact.”

This latter point conflicts with the assessment of Kent County Council as highways authority, who informed the Borough Council that “The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of its relatively unsustainable location.” However, the assessment then added that the site was adjacent to the settlement of

Langley Heath, which has a doctor's surgery, recreation ground/play area and village hall.

It appears that this is another example of a site which the Borough Council did not want to allocate, despite the response of consultees.

Qn13.6 What is the site area and has a site plan been submitted which identifies the site ?

My client's land covers an area of 6.4ha. However, it is proposed that only 0.6ha of the site fronting Green Lane be developed for residential purposes.

A plan of the site, showing the total area owned by my clients along with that proposed for development , has been submitted to the Council and is attached.

Qn13.7 What type and amount of development could be expected and at what density.

A modest number of dwellings, perhaps 10-15, could be developed here. If, however, the Council wanted more land for just affordable housing, public open space or similar facilities, then my client would be pleased to provide that as well.

Qn13.8 When could development be delivered and at what rate ?

The development could begin reasonably soon after permission was granted, since there is no reason why it need be delayed.

Qn13.9 What evidence is there of the viability of the proposed development ?

As can be seen from the SHEDLAA, there are no viability issues – a view with which the owners' concur.

Qn13.10 Has the site been the subject of sustainability appraisal and does the Representor have any comments on its conclusion ?

The 2016 Assessment identifies the site as being distant from a primary school and post office, but not an unreasonable distance from other facilities. Moreover, development would not have a significant environmental impact in terms of landscape and the historical environment.

It is contended that the Council has ignored paragraph 55 of the NPPF, which states that the ability of development in one village to support services in a nearby village is

an example of sustainable development in rural areas. Moreover, the Practice Guidance states that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas and blanket policies restricting development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

In this borough, the Council has nevertheless decided to restrict development outside the town of Maidstone to just five rural service centres and five larger villages and to restrict it everywhere else. That stance is fundamentally wrong.

Qn13.11 What constraints are there on the site's development and how could any adverse impacts be mitigated ?

There are no known constraints to development.