

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

<http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/residents/planning/local-plan/examination>

SESSION 13B – ALTERNATIVE SITES

Hearing Statements: Please refer to the Inspector's Procedural Guidance Notes for information on the provision of hearing statements.

*Deadline: One electronic copy in pdf format and three hard copies to be sent to the PO by 6.00pm on **10 November 2016**.*

Inspector's Agenda with Matters, Issues, and Questions

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Alternative site proposals are unlikely to progress any further unless the Inspector has concluded that there is a shortfall in the development proposed in the plan or that other proposed developments are unsuitable meaning that the Local Plan is unsound as submitted. In that event the Inspector would be likely to refer the issue back to the Council to consider whether they wished to identify alternative development sites to address the soundness issue.
- 1.2. Before any site were to be recommended for inclusion in the Plan there would need to be a further public consultation on the associated proposed modifications with an opportunity for representations by interested persons.
- 1.3. This hearing and any associated written statements in response to the identified questions provides an opportunity to establish whether sufficient information is available to inform the site selection process.
- 1.4. Those who are proposing alternative site allocations may also submit written statements in response to the questions set out below whether or not they have not chosen to participate in the hearings.
- 1.5. Where the relevant information has been provided with the Regulation 19 representations or is already available in another document in the Examination Library it is not necessary to repeat it but the appropriate document reference and any site reference number should be provided.

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

- 1.6. Separate responses to the following questions should be submitted for each proposed development site.

**Qn13.20 Does the site have any relevant planning history?
(applications, permissions, appeals, previous allocations)**

**Qn13.21 What is the site's policy status in the submitted Local Plan?
(eg whether in defined settlement/countryside/AONB/conservation
area/Landscape of Local Value etc)**

**Qn13.22 What is the site's policy status in any made or emerging
neighbourhood plan?**

**Qn13.23 Is the site greenfield or previously developed (brownfield)
land according to the definition in the glossary of the National Planning
Policy Framework?**

**Qn13.24 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 (SHEDDLAA) and
does the Representer have any comments on its conclusions.**

**Qn13.25 What is the site area and is has a site plan been submitted
which identifies the site?**

**Qn13.26 What type, and amount of development could be expected
and at what density?**

Qn13.27 When could development be delivered and at what rate?

Qn13.28 What evidence is there of the viability of the proposed development?

Qn13.30 Has the site been the subject of sustainability appraisal and does the Representer have any comments on its conclusions?

Qn13.31 What constraints are there on the site's development and how could any adverse impacts be mitigated?

Issue (ii) Whether the Plan would be unsound without the requested amendments to Policy H1(68) sought by Representation R19107

- 1.7. Representation R19107 seeks a number of wording changes to Policy H1(68) Bentletts Yard, Claygate Road which the Representer considers would improve the policy.

Qn13.32 Are these changes necessary for soundness, and if so, why?