

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-2
Site name/address	Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road
Landowner	Mr John Mills
Agent	John Bishop and Associates
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	9.6
Proposed yield	600-800 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to urban area
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites/Local Plan Rep seeking an additional area for allocation

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Bicknor Farm comprises a mix of arable and pasture lands, as well as some wooded areas, the largest section of which is Bicknor Wood. Fields that comprise the site are easy to distinguish from one another, with natural boundaries present throughout. The main Bicknor Farm buildings, as well as Bicknor Farm Cottages stand at the western part of the site boundary with the A274 Sutton Road.
Current use	Agricultural.
Adjacent uses	North – Three Tees residential settlement. South – A274 Sutton Road, golf driving range, tree nursery. East – Rumwood Nursery. West – agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	None.
Planning history	Various applications going back to the late 1970s, associated with agricultural use and with extensions to residential properties at the site.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Yes. The inspector declined to add this allocation to the North of Sutton Road allocation because of: a) Harm to the countryside. b) Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	From Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment 2012.  The site lies within the broader Farleigh Greensand Fruit Belt character area (LCA 27), falling within detailed landscape character area 30.3 Gore Court Farm, the key characteristics for which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat topography.</li> <li>• Medium sized, irregular shaped fields- arable.</li> <li>• Remnant woodland blocks including ancient woodland.</li> <li>• Parkland landscape of Gore Court.</li> <li>• Traditional buildings.</li> <li>• Some suburban influence on land use and vegetation.</li> </ul>

	<p><u>Views</u>: Fairly contained views suffering urban edge influences.</p> <p><u>Condition</u>: Very Good <u>Sensitivity</u>: Moderate</p> <p><u>Landscape Guidelines</u>: Conserve/reinforce. Generic guidelines include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate fruit growing should be promoted.</li> <li>• Conserve traditional landscape patterns &amp; connectivity.</li> <li>• Conserve/reinstate hedgerow boundaries.</li> </ul> <p>Actions for the site to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve/reinforce woodland with links to AW &amp; parkland.</li> <li>• Conserve parkland characteristics.</li> <li>• Conserve setting of Gore Court &amp; Rumwood Park.</li> <li>• Conserve grazing land.</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>There is an area of ancient woodland within the site. Grassland field with scattered trees and mature trees along the SE, South and Northern boundary of the site. There are buildings and hard standing within the SW corner of the site. There is a pond within the site and several within 100m of the site. Protected/notable species may be present including reptiles/GCN/ Bats (roosting and foraging) and breeding birds.</p> <p>1/4, 1 is most sensitive.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>Ancient woodland area (Bicknor Wood) within site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous Tree Protection Orders to the east and northeast of site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TPO No.35 of 1981; TPO No.45 of 1981.</li> <li>- TPO No.44 of 1981; TPO No.42 of 1981.</li> <li>- TPO No. 5 of 1970.</li> <li>- TPO No. 14 of 2003 (woodland on eastern boundary).</li> <li>- TPO No. 36 of 2001- west of site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bicknor Wood comprises approx 3.5ha of the site's north west corner (TPO No.37 of 1981 (Bicknor Wood)).</li> </ul>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Bicknor Farmhouse (on site) to west and Rumwood Court (adjacent to site) to the east are both Grade II Listed Buildings.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>Site contains the find spot of a medieval fitting and a post medieval historic farm complex of Bicknor Farm.</p> <p>3/5, 5 is the least sensitive.</p>
PROW (within or near site)	Footpath KM94 runs in a north-south direction

<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>through the centre of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for access from the A274 Sutton Road and/or White Horse Lane, although KCC preference would be for the primary vehicular access to be taken from Sutton Road in view of the restricted nature of White Horse Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys direct access to the A274 Sutton Road, which has a relatively good crash record, although there is a poor crash record at its junctions with New Road, Wallis Avenue and Willington Street which may require mitigation. A continuous footway link to the services and facilities within Park Wood is provided on Sutton Road, although consideration should be given to upgrading this to a foot/cycleway and extending the 30mph speed limit eastward to the site access.</li> <li>• All of the services within Park Wood are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on Sutton Road are served by Bus Route 12, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone Town Centre, Headcorn and Tenterden on weekdays.</li> <li>• See also Highways requirements within Policy SS2 of the Maidstone Core Strategy Strategic Site Allocations document.</li> </ul>
<p>Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school</p>	<p>Public Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buses 84, 85, 86 – Shepway/Senacre Wood – Town Centre – Hospital (frequency of 10 mins at peak).</li> <li>• No. 82 Bus service from Maidstone town centre to Parkwood (Wallis Ave) is well used and has a frequency of every 10 mins at peak times – this service also runs through the town centre to Maidstone Hospital.</li> <li>• No. 13 – Town centre – Sutton Rd – Otham – Langley Heath – Leeds – Hollingbourne stops near Morrisons approx every 2 hours.</li> <li>• No. 64 – Cornwallis Academy – Sutton Road – Park Wood – Langley (peak times).</li> </ul> <p>The site is on the edge of Maidstone and there are local shops, schools and bus services reasonably close by. In addition, Parkwood Industrial Estate offers the possibility of local jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shopping parade at Wallis Ave, Parkwood is approx 1km from site = 15-20 min walk. There is a further parade of shops to the north of the site at Senacre (1km from site).</li> <li>• Morrisons supermarket Sutton Road is approx 1.5km from site.</li> <li>• Nearest primary school is in Parkwood approx 1km from site (10-15min walk).</li> <li>• Nearest secondary school is New Line Learning near Linton corner.</li> </ul>

	Nearest GP is at Wallis Avenue Parkwood (10 min walk) – Also a GP at St Saviours Road and Grove Park near Morrisons.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>The primary impact on residential amenity, if apparent, would be to the existing settlement at Three Tees and this would be dependent on where access to the site is taken from. Otherwise, the site has good access to the A274 Sutton Road.</p> <p>Open space at this location is not formal and the land is privately owned. A footpath does cross the site north to south, so a walking route for local people would undoubtedly be affected.</p>
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Southern Water advise that significant off-site sewerage infrastructure will be required to serve the strategic locations in the Maidstone Urban Area. This is the case regardless of which sites are selected. The need for this infrastructure should be identified in policy terms in the Core Strategy. This does not preclude any of the sites from future development.
Air quality/noise	Site is adjacent to Maidstone urban area air quality management area.
Land contamination	No comments.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Zone 1.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>The central part of the site is a proposed allocation in the Reg. 18 consultation draft of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>There is no need to delete this allocation.</p> <p>The revised submission seeks the inclusion of a significant further area of land to the east and also a smaller area in the SW corner of the proposed allocated area.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> If the substantial additional area of land to the east were to be allocated this would adversely affect the parkland setting of Rumwood Court.</p> <p>The smaller area to the SW corner is however acceptable as this would enable the provision of an additional arm of the new roundabout serving the Langley Park Farm development on the south side of Sutton Road.</p> <p>The draft proposals submitted for pre-application discussion already include this area.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Yes Pre-application discussions are taking place with regard to the existing proposed allocated site H1(9).  Jones Homes are the interested developer
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this time period
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The central part of the site is a proposed allocation in the Reg. 18 consultation draft of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>There is no need to delete this allocation.</p> <p>The revised submission seeks the inclusion of a significant further area of land to the east and also a smaller area in the SW corner of the proposed allocated area.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> If the substantial additional area of land to the east were to be allocated this would adversely affect the parkland setting of Rumwood Court.</p> <p>The smaller area to the SW corner is however acceptable as this would enable the provision of an additional arm of the new roundabout serving the Langley Park Farm development on the south side of Sutton Road.</p> <p>The draft proposals submitted for pre-application discussion already include this area. This area should be included and the draft policy amended accordingly.</p> <p>MINOR CHANGE to development area in policy H1(9)</p> <p>YIELD to remain at 335.</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-15
Site name/address	Headcorn Road, Staplehurst,
Landowner	Mr P M Stanley
Agent	
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	15
Proposed yield	165 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to rural settlement (RSC)
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site is located to the east of Staplehurst. To the west of the site are residential properties, with the back gardens of these properties backing onto the fields. To the north of the site is the open fields of Fishers Farm and a commercial property. To the east of the site are further open fields. To the south of the site is a farm complex and further open fields.</p> <p>There are a number of small trees within the site although there are no TPOs served upon these.</p> <p>There are no ponds within the application site although there is one adjacent to one.</p> <p>Public footpath KM303 runs through the site from north to south. Footpath KM304 runs through the southern portion of the site from east to west.</p> <p>The land is generally flat.</p>
Current use	Agricultural.
Adjacent uses	Residential and agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Special Landscape Area.
Planning history	MA/03/1645 - Retrospective application for the change of use of land from agricultural to mixed use of agricultural and the keeping of horses. Approved.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	N/A
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012</p> <p>Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of the Low Weald.</li> <li>• Small fields with orchards, pasture, ponds and watercourses enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere.</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing</li> </ul>

	<p>hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed for intensive arable cultivation.</li> <li>• Sparse scattered small woodlands.</li> <li>• Winding roads with wide verges bounded by ditches and mixed native hedgerows.</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden.</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guideline: Conserve.</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land and orchards and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads and hamlets</li> <li>• Resist further linear development and intrusive elements along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	The majority of the site is grassland fields with intermittent hedges throughout the site. A small area to the north of the site is a nursery which is hard standing or sheds. The buildings may have some limited potential to be suitable for roosting bats. There are 4 ponds on site with several more within the surrounding area - potential of GCN being present within the site.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	TPO12/2001 is/are within the adjacent land. No TPOs within the site itself.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	There are no listed buildings within the site or in close proximity of the site.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Nothing known.
PROW (within or near site)	Public footpath KM303 runs through the site from north to south. Footpath KM304 runs through the

	southern portion of the site from east to west.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Large site accessed directly from Headcorn Road, which has a footway on the opposite side of the road to the site from Staplehurst centre to the junction with Slaney Road. This would need to be extended to the site and a pedestrian crossing installed.</p> <p>Headcorn Road currently has a national speed limit past the site and this would need to be changed to 30mph for the site to be acceptable.</p> <p>Poor crash record on the bend adjacent to the NE corner of the site would require improvement for the development to be acceptable.</p> <p>The junction between Headcorn Road and the A229 would also require improvement for a large development to be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Access to existing public transport would not be acceptable from many parts of the site which would be over 400M walking distance to the nearest bus stop and therefore a new or enhanced bus service that serves the site directly would need to be provided.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>The site is located within approximately 800metres of a site for an approved supermarket, and approximately 300metres from the existing village centre.</p> <p>The railway station would be approximately 1km from the site (nearest point).</p> <p>The nearest bus stop would be approximately 400metres from the application site.</p> <p>The nearest health centre is located to the rear of the library which is approximately 300metres from the site.</p> <p>The nearest primary school is approximately 400 metres from the site. There is no secondary school provision within the village.</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>The site would be adjacent to existing residential properties, however, the impact upon these properties could be mitigated through a suitable design. Access could be made into the site within the need for an entry point that would significantly impact upon residential amenity. In terms of access to open space, the site would adjoin open fields, and would also be of a scale that would require the provision of internal play provision.</p>
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	<p>The site is in close proximity of existing residential properties that are all served by the necessary utilities. Subject to the necessary consents, these could be connected in to.</p>
Air quality/noise	N/A
Land contamination	N/A
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p>The site does not fall within a flood risk area. However, there are water bodies within. The site would be of a size where SUDs could be utilised.</p>

Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is well screened from the west, and in part from the commercial buildings to the north. It is located within a relatively sustainable location, being within walking distance of local amenities. However, the station and the nearest bus stop would be a significant distance from properties to the south of the site. There would be a relatively high impact upon the character and appearance of the locality, as the site contributes significantly to the locality.
-------------------------------------	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Yes willing landowner whole site available. Un-named developer interest.
Availability conclusion	The site is available.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<p><i>'Overall conclusions: There are a number of transport mitigation measures in order to bring forward development on this site. There would be a relatively high impact upon the character and appearance of the locality, as the site contributes significantly to the locality. These factors along with the uncertainty of having a developer linked to the site bring into question its deliverability. Coupled with the probable reliance on the car given the distance to public transport links mean that on balance it is recommended for rejection.'</i></p>	
There have been no material changes in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment was concluded to warrant a different decision being made.	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-16
Site name/address	The Brishings, Green Lane, Langley
Landowner	Mr R Schroeder
Agent	
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	1.9
Proposed yield	50
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to settlement
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site comprises evergreen conifer (Christmas trees). The land is relatively flat with residential development to the north. Green Lane is narrow and there are clear views of the site from Green Lane with boundary screening from Leeds Road.
Current use	Commercial Conifer growing.
Adjacent uses	There is existing woodland to the south of the site, residential to the north east and west. There are some Listed Buildings in the locality.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	The site lies in the open countryside and the designated Southern Anti-coalescence Belt.
Planning history	<p>14/0545 (LAND EAST OF, GREEN LANE, LANGLEY, KENT, ME17 3JW) - Outline application for 50(no) retirement bungalows with all other matters reserved for future consideration. – REFUSED</p> <p>90/0322 (Land at Green Lane LANGLEY) - Residential development – Refused</p> <p>90/0321 (Land at Green Lane LANGLEY) - Residential development – Refused</p> <p>80/0885 (Part of Green Lane Farm, Green Lane, Langley) - Outline application for residential development on estate – Refused</p> <p>78/1660 (Green Lane Farm, Green Lane, Langley, Sutton Valence) - Residential development – Refused</p> <p>78/1659 (Green Lane Farm, Green Lane, Langley, Sutton Valence) - Residential development – Refused</p>
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	<p>YES MBWLP 2000</p> <p>Land at Green Lane, Langley was considered by the Inspector and whilst unclear of the exact site, the Inspector did conclude to –</p>

<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p><i>“Not modify the Plan in response to this objection”.</i></p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 30-8: Langley Fruit Plateau</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale field pattern for orchard and soft fruit production</li> <li>• Grazed pasture</li> <li>• Species rich native hedgerows</li> <li>• Small mixed woodland blocks</li> <li>• River Len situated in shallow valley to the north</li> <li>• Numerous vernacular style buildings and use of local materials</li> <li>• Pockets of high density, recent development.</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Very Good Sensitivity Assessment: Very High Guidelines: CONSERVE AND REINFORCE</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the species rich hedgerows</li> <li>• Conserve the small scale, historic, enclosed field pattern and areas of fruit production</li> <li>• Conserve the remote qualities of the Len Valley and its setting, and strengthen vegetation along the River Len and adjoining ditches to improve habitat connectivity</li> <li>• Conserve the traditional, rural setting of vernacular style buildings and Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Resist further conversion to intensive arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance poplar shelterbelts and other vegetation which softens polytunnels and large agricultural barns</li> <li>• Avoid junction improvements which detract from the distinctive narrow country lanes.</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>Previous assessment stated as follows</p> <p><u>KCC Biodiversity advice</u> –</p> <p><i>“We advise that most of the allocation sites will require preliminary ecological appraisal and some will require specific protected species surveys to ensure that all relevant material considerations can be addressed in the determination of applications. Ecological assessments will also support the developers in achieving BREEAM Code for Sustainable Homes targets and identify opportunities for ecological enhancements that will support Maidstone BC in meeting the principles of the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>It is rough grassland which has been recorded as neutral grassland within the 2012 Habitat Survey. The site has mature trees or hedgerows along the northern and eastern boundary. There is woodland</i></p>

	<p><i>on the southern boundary. There is potential for protected/notable species to be present including reptiles, foraging bats, flora and invertebrates."</i></p> <p>Constraints Level 2 - Potential for moderate ecological impacts.</p> <p>Officer comment The site is largely given over to a Christmas tree plantation. However the site is otherwise unmanaged and has extensive grass cover within the site and hedges trees around its edges.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>Comments from Landscape team are as follows:</p> <p>Tree protection status: Whilst there are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) protecting trees on site there appear to be significant trees within hedgerows on site boundaries.</p> <p>Ancient woodlands (<i>from 'a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone borough, August 2012'</i>) There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p>Hedgerow status: There are potentially 'important' hedgerows.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	None
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Not within a safeguarded Area of Archaeological Potential
PROW (within or near site)	None
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties in Langley Heath.</li> <li>• Potential for access from Green Lane and/or the B2163 Leeds Road, although KCC's preference would be for the primary vehicular access to be taken from Leeds Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys direct access to the B2163 Leeds Road, which has a relatively good crash record and adequate forward visibility. A continuous footway link to the bus stops on Leeds Road is provided.</li> <li>• There are few services within walking or cycling distance of the site; however the nearby bus stops on Leeds Road are served by Bus Route 13, which provides a service to Maidstone every two hours on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Site is 337m from medical/GP service Site is 3,362m from secondary school Site is 1,972m from primary school Site is 1,786m from post office Site is 1,342m from outdoor sports facility 344m from 'neighbourhood' children's play space 245m from the nearest area of publicly accessible green space 344m from bus stop</p>

	4,235m from train station 604m from cycle route
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	It is considered that a development could be provided on site without detriment to existing residential amenity.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Close to other residential properties and roads, so it is likely that connection to utilities would be possible.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue
Land contamination	Not on or within 250m of landfill site.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p><u>Flood Risk</u> Surface runoff from all sites should be managed using sustainable drainage techniques, with discharge restricted to no more than runoff from the existing site following the critical rainfall events for a range of return periods, up to an including the 100yr event. An allowance for climate change should also be included the drainage design.</p> <p>This site is within the 'Boughton Monchelsea Drainage Strategy area' -</p> <p>EA Comments: <u>Boughton Monchelsea Drainage Strategy</u> The area between Cliff Hill and Beresfords Hill of Boughton Monchelsea (NGR TQ773517) is at risk of flooding. The flooding mechanism of this area is complex and believed to be a combination of fluvial and groundwater flooding. Particular attention must therefore be given to means of surface water disposal from any new development upstream from Boughton Monchelsea, especially if infiltration of surface water drainage is being considered. This is because the structure of the underlying geology could allow rapid infiltration from a developed area to discharge to the watercourse to the south more rapidly than the natural greenfield rate, thereby increasing flood risk to existing properties.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reservoir at Brishing Lane is maintained and operated by the Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council for flood alleviation purposes. Significant expenditure is likely to be required in order to raise the standard of reservoir safety of this structure. We recommend the local authority consult the Parish Council and seek a financial contribution from all potential developers in this catchment to secure funding for essential long term maintenance and improvements to this structure.</p>
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>The site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>The settlement is unsustainable with few, if any, services.</p> <p>There is likely to be a high reliance on the use of the</p>

	private car by residents
--	--------------------------

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner Current developer interest (Wards/Barratts)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<p><i>'The landowner suggests that a development of 60 dwellings be considered for the site. I consider that were the site to be developed for housing, taking into account landscape buffers and green space and a low density development that an appropriate yield would be more likely around 45 dwellings. However, notwithstanding the potential site capacity, it is not considered that this is an appropriate use for this site due to its edge of village location. Whilst there may be no highway or overriding consultee objections to delivering a scheme on this site, the site performs poorly in terms of sustainability and residents would be heavily reliant on the private car for the majority of their trips.</i></p> <p><i>The redevelopment of the site would transform the existing character of the area and there would be significant encroachment into the countryside.'</i></p>	
The material considerations and circumstances relating to this site have not changed since the previous assessment.	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-17
Site name/address	Ashford Drive, Kingswood
Landowner	Mr P Howard & Mrs Rafill.
Agent	Maurice Ashenden-Bax
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	Approx 0.3
Proposed yield	6 bungalows
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to rural settlement of Kingswood
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site is a level parcel of land abutting and to the north of the settlement boundary of Kingswood. It is a roughly rectangular open grassed field with some scrub in places. The field is open to the southwest corner where access could be achieved onto Ashford Drive.
Current use	Nil use
Adjacent uses	It is bounded by close boarded fencing and houses on the south side, coppice ancient woodland on the east side, a conifer hedge and horse paddock beyond to the north and an access track and local needs housing beyond to the west (Peter Pease Close).
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	None, although adjacent to ancient woodland. Landscape officer states that whilst the trees on the site are not currently protected there appear to be trees on the eastern boundary which merit protection by a TPO.
Planning history	14/502420/FULL: Construction of 4 detached single storey dwellings and access road: UNDETERMINED  MA/97/0251 - Erection of 3 no detached dwellings with garaging and formation of a new vehicular access to Ashford Drive – REFUSED & APPEAL DISMISSED (Unjustified extension of development into open countryside)
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Development would extend out into the countryside and may prove harmful to adjacent ancient woodland. Views would be possible from the very end of Ashford Drive. There are no medium or long range views as the public footpath 190m to the north is screened by woodland.  Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 31: Kingswood Plateau  KEY CHARACTERISTICS • Extensive tracts of mixed and sweet chestnut

	<p>coppice woodland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plateau of Greensand Ridge and dip slope to east</li> <li>• Deep loam to clay soils with extensive deposits of head</li> <li>• Ponds, some of which are species rich</li> <li>• Strong sense of enclosure</li> <li>• Extensive recent development</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment Good Sensitivity Assessment Moderate Guidelines – Conserve and Reinforce</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Conserve the characteristic central cross contour road and the peripheral pattern of small tree blocks and tree lines</li> <li>• Conserve and restore hedgerows and mature hedgerow trees</li> <li>• Conserve characteristic blocks of remnant ancient woodland and, where appropriate and where opportunities arise, facilitate 'healthy' woodland Extensions</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	Adjacent to Ancient Woodland so high potential for ecological impact.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	Designated Ancient Woodland adjoins the site on the east side.
Agricultural land quality	Possibly Grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	None.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Nothing known
PROW (within or near site)	Public footpath KH301 is 190m north of the site.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Access could be achieved onto Ashford Drive. It enjoys relatively good access to the A274 North Street via Broomfield Road and Chartway Street and the A20 via Broomfield Road which have a good crash record. All of the village services within Kingswood are within walking and cycling distance of the site via continuous footway links and the nearby bus stops on Broomfield Road are served by Bus Route 59, which provides two return journeys a day to Maidstone.</p> <p>KCC Highways advise the site may be suitable for a limited quantum of housing.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Bus stop: 120m</p> <p>Train stations: Harrietsham 5.8km, Hollingbourne 6.1km, Lenham 7.1km, Headcorn 8.7km, Maidstone West 12.3km, Maidstone East 12.9km</p> <p>Shop: 300m</p> <p>Primary school: 750m</p> <p>GP: 3.7km (Langley), 4.2km and 4.3km (Sutton Valence (2 surgeries)), 6.2km (Harrietsham), 8km (Lenham),</p>
Impacts on existing residential	Development of the site would impact negatively on

amenity (including access to open space)	the amenity of adjacent dwellings to the south and west.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Edge of village so available.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue
Land contamination	Unlikely.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Zone 1
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Development of this site would prove an unjustified extension into the open countryside and would prove harmful to adjacent ancient woodland and residential amenity.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner who has now submitted an application for 4 single-storey dwellings
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer previously indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Development of this site would prove an unjustified extension into the open countryside and would prove harmful to adjacent ancient woodland and residential amenity. Furthermore, because of the limited services and facilities in the village, development of this site is considered unsustainable and not in keeping with the Borough Council's spatial distribution of development. I recommend this site is rejected.'</i>	
It is not considered that there has been an significant change in circumstances since the previous assessment to warrant a different conclusion being reached	
REJECT	
YIELD -0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-20
Site name/address	Hoppersfield, Tonbridge Road
Landowner	Mr Bowra
Agent	Mr Bowra
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.44
Proposed yield	8 to 12 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Proposed site within rural location adjacent to urban boundary.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site is adjacent to Tonbridge Road and to the west of the urban boundary of Maidstone. The site is within an Area of Local Landscape Importance. The pattern of development is inconsistent and more sporadic within this area outside of the urban boundary. A cluster of development to the west of the site. The site is within the Medway Valley and therefore there are extensive views to the rear across the valley.</p> <p>The site is set on a lower level than the road and has an existing vehicular access from Tonbridge Road. The site contains 3 buildings including 'The Cookhouse' which is a Grade II listed building and 'The Sheephouse'. The remaining barn style building is sited adjacent to the road.</p> <p>Much of the square shaped site is laid to lawn with some landscaping including a line of established planting to the southern boundary.</p>
Current use	'The Cookhouse ' and 'The Sheephouse' on site have lawful uses as tourist accommodation. The remaining barn style building appears to be used for storage purposes.
Adjacent uses	Residential uses are predominantly within the vicinity of the site including a residential development of No8 dwellings and of 1980's construction. To the east and south of the site are agricultural fields.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Area of Local Landscape Importance Open Countryside location
Planning history	Extensive planning history at this site for the conversion of a number of buildings within the site for tourist accommodation use. Planning permission has also been refused and dismissed at appeal for the conversion of these buildings for residential use.

	11/0850, 05/1775, 05/0071, 04/0387, 03/0285, 03/0217, 02/2221, 01/2059, 00/0830, 00/0103, 99/1493
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	SHLAA 2009 – Reason for rejection:-  Unacceptable effect upon the setting of a Listed Building. Planning history of refusals and dismissed appeals, permission unlikely to be granted.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site falls within character area 21-1 – Barming Slopes</li> <li>2. Key Characteristics (blue box) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong enclosure by extensive woodlands to the north</li> <li>• Dramatically isolated church building</li> <li>• Large arable fields to the west</li> <li>• Small area of orchards in the north east</li> <li>• Long views out across the Medway to West Farleigh Medway Valley Side</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. From Summary of Analysis Box <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condition Assessment = Moderate</li> <li>• Sensitivity Assessment = Low</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Guideline = Improve and Reinforce <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Conserve traditional buildings and the striking isolated location of the church</li> <li>• Improve the definition of, and strengthen the boundary with, the urban edge</li> <li>• Improve the quality of existing boundaries</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<b>KCC Ecology Response</b> – “Ex Farm Buildings, amenity grassland and areas of scrub. The buildings are in poor condition so potential for bats to be roosting”. (2)
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	No TPOs on site and although there are some trees within the hedgerows there are no specific specimens that would be worthy of a TPO.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> The site contains a listed building, the former hoppers’ kitchen. Development of the site would remove the rural and agricultural context for this heritage asset which given its original use would be highly detrimental to its significance.</p> <p>Forge House adjacent is a former Grade II listed building of late 18<sup>th</sup>/ early 19<sup>th</sup> Century date. Its setting has already been compromised to its western side by the development of houses in the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Development of this site would further dilute its setting.</p>

	<p>There are also currently attractive rural views over the site towards the spire of the Grade I listed parish church of Barming. The isolated rural setting of this church is an important contributor to its significance and the incursion of urban development into this view will have some detrimental impact.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Archaeology:</b> No known implications.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p><b>KCC Archaeology Response:-</b></p> <p>site lies north of some Roman activity sites, including a walled cemetery; site contains former Hoppers Field farm complex with one historic barn building surviving on site; includes the Cookhouse Listed Building.</p>
PROW (within or near site)	Public Right of Way KM8 is located to the west of the site and extends from Tonbridge Road south through agricultural land.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p><b>KCC Highways Comments:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessed form the A26 Tonbridge Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys direct access to the A26 Tonbridge Road, which has a relatively good crash record, although there is a poor crash record at its junction with North Street and South Street which may require mitigation. A continuous footway link to the centre of Barming is provided on the northern side of Tonbridge Road.</li> <li>• All of the services within Barming are within walking and cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on Tonbridge Road are served by Bus Routes 6, 6A and 7, which provide a combined service to Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells every 15 minutes on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Good access to services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 1.5m of East Farleigh Rail Station.</li> <li>• Within 0.3m of bus stop, and local convenience shop.</li> <li>• Within 0.7m of local primary school.</li> <li>• Within 1.2m of GP surgery.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open	There would not be a significant impact upon neighbouring amenity. Depending of residential

space)	layout, potential for overlooking/loss of privacy to
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Utilities available on site and have been previously supplied.
Air quality/noise	As the site is adjacent to Tonbridge Road, air quality and noise would be an issue. However, mitigation of this would be possible with suitable conditions imposed to any planning permission.  Outside of AQMA.
Land contamination	There is unlikely to be a significant contamination issue at this site. Although, a suitable condition could be imposed due to agricultural storage which may have taken place at this site over time.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	The site is not within a flood zone and there is unlikely to be any flooding issues.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Good access to public transport and highway network.</li> <li>• Good access to local services.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade II listed building within site.</li> <li>• Rural and historic character of existing site.</li> <li>• Scale of site would only provide limited housing yield.</li> <li>• Extensive views possible of the site within surrounding area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The site is not suitable for development due to the impact upon the listed building within the site and the visual impact upon the locality due to the extensive views of the site.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
<p>Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	<p>The site is in single ownership with the tourist uses on site run by the landowner who is willing to develop the site.</p> <p>No existing tenancy agreements or leases outstanding.</p>
Availability conclusion	The site is available for development and could be developed in 2012-2016.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Due to the location of the site close to listed buildings, any design would need to be of quality in form and materials. This may hinder development to some degree.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>Overall, this site significantly contributes to the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings.</p> <p>Whilst the listed building does not have a curtilage per-se, development would still need to respect its setting.</p> <p>Whilst the site is sustainable to some degree, this is outweighed due to the impact upon the buildings of merit which would be compromised as a result of development.</p> <p>The site remains unacceptable for development.</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-23
Site name/address	Gore Court.
Landowner	James Barker.
Agent	Peter Court Associates.
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield.
Site area (ha)	4.6
Proposed yield	Not indicated.
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted in fresh Call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The land being promoted for development at Gore Court, Church Lane is within the same ownership of Gore Court house (a Grade II* listed building) and is screened from that particular building by mature trees.</p> <p>The site is bounded by East Wood (ancient woodland) to the south east, open countryside to the north and south, and the western boundary of the site along Church Road comprises woodland (approx 70m strip, including ancient woodland at Senacre Wood) forming part of the screen between the site and Woolley Road (Senacre/Shepway). The site is currently in use as a private garden to Gore Court, and can be described in general terms as an attractive parkland setting.</p>
Current use	Garden/private amenity.
Adjacent uses	Farmland and open countryside. A large section of the site to the west lies in close proximity to Woolley Road and a number of the small residential estates that use Woolley Road to connect to Willington Street.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside.
Planning history	Gore Court is a Grade II* listed building and has been granted planning permission for alterations to doors and fenestration. Within the grounds of Gore Court an associated building has been converted to residential accommodation.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>From Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment 2012</p> <p>The site lies within the broader Langley Heath undulating farmlands character area (LCA 30), falling within detailed landscape character area 30.3 Gore Court Farm, the key characteristics for which are:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flat topography</li> <li>• Medium-sized irregular fields – arable</li> <li>• Remnant woodland blocks include. AW</li> <li>• Parkland landscape of Gore Court</li> <li>• Some suburban influence on land use and vegetation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Views:</u> Parkland views, opening up to views across the North Downs</p> <p><u>Condition:</u> Very Good <u>Sensitivity:</u> Moderate</p> <p><u>Landscape Guidelines:</u> Conserve &amp; reinforce. Generic guidelines include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of appropriate fruit growing.</li> <li>• Conserve traditional landscape patterns &amp; connectivity</li> <li>• Conserve/reinstate hedgerow boundaries.</li> </ul> <p>Actions for the site to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve/reinforce woodland with links to AW &amp; parkland.</li> <li>• Conserve parkland characteristics.</li> <li>• Conserve setting of Gore Court &amp; Rumwood Park.</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>Two areas of Ancient Woodland lie in relatively close proximity to the east and west site boundaries.</p> <p>A pond lies within woodland on-site.</p> <p>KCC advise that the presence of and potential for impacts to protected species would need to be assessed at the application stage for the site. Surveys may be needed for dormice, breeding birds and bats. A preliminary ecological assessment would provide detailed recommendations for specific surveys. In addition to mitigation for protected species impacts, there would also need to be measures in place to minimise the potential for development at this location to result in deterioration of the woodlands around the site.</p> <p>Kent Wildlife Trust raises concerns over the potential for ancient woodland to be further fragmented and become ringed by development and seeks the protection and enhancement of all woodland on site will need to be secured within policy.</p> <p>Maidstone Borough Council –Local Biodiversity Access (LBAP) Plan advises that the site is one of a number of undeveloped sites which act as buffers and stepping stones between remaining Ancient Woodland blocks and Mote Park.</p>

	<p>Ancient and species rich hedgerows are a UK BAP habitat but for which we have no specific LBAP action plan. Connectivity with hedgerows in this area is important but MBC has no specific projects in the area.</p> <p>1/4, 1 is the most sensitive.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	No Tree Protection Orders on site. However, there are a number of mature trees on and adjacent to site with protectable trees/groups/woodland south of Gore Court.
Agricultural land quality	Land is generally grade 2 agricultural land in this area. However, this site is in use as a private garden.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Gore Court is a grade II* listed building.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>Site contains the medieval and post medieval complex of Gore Court with its associated formal gardens and wider parkland landscape. Site is likely to contain sensitive medieval and later archaeology, upstanding remains and historic landscape features.</p> <p>3/5, 5 is least sensitive.</p>
PROW (within or near site)	To the east of the site a public right of way runs in a generally north-south direction, providing access from Church Lane and White Horse Lane out towards Green Hill in the centre of Otham village (KM87, KM88, KM90).
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Access to the site would be from Church Road, which links the site to the residential area of Downswood less than 1 mile to the north, and Sutton Road (via Gore Court Road) less than 1 mile to the south. Church Road is a narrow minor road which for the most part passes through woodland, thus reducing visibility.</p> <p>Access is an issue in this area, particularly because of the distance from the site to Sutton Road (A274) and the width of Church Road/Gore Court Road, which links to this main transport artery into the town centre. Access to Willington street (which would provide the option of linking to Sutton Road or Ashford Road (A20)) is possible but not preferred as this would result in directing traffic on narrow roads through the established residential areas of Downswood and Senacre.</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buses 84, 85 &amp; 86 – Shepway/Senacre Wood (Woolley Road) – Town Centre. Bus stop is less than 5 min walk from site – but would involve creating a linkage through a 30m woodland strip to Woolley Road.</li> <li>• No. 82 Bus service from Maidstone town centre to Parkwood (Wallis Ave) is well used and has a frequency of every 10 mins at peak times – this service also runs through the town centre to Maidstone Hospital. Site is approx 20 min walk</li> </ul>

	from bus stop.
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Geographically the site is in close proximity to the Senacre shopping parade on Woolley Road but access to this area would have to be provided through a strip of woodland (approx 70m) between Church Road and Woolley Road. There would have to be a crossing point on Woolley Road but existing speed ramps on this road make this an easy solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearest primary school is 10-15min walk.</li> <li>• Nearest secondary school is New Line Learning near Linton corner.</li> <li>• Nearest GP is 0.5 miles.</li> <li>• Nearest dentist is 0.4 miles.</li> <li>• Nearest PO is at parade of shops (Senacre) a 5-10 min walk away. Also have the parade of shops at Parkwood less than 1 mile away.</li> <li>• Morrisons supermarket Sutton Road is approx 1 mile from site.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>Impacts on existing residential amenity are not immediate. Gore Court could only likely be developed as part of a wider land release that links it to the existing urban area to the west. As part of this there would traffic and open space considerations to take into account, which would affect the living environment for existing residents in the area. It is difficult to define exactly, but there is a question of intensity and the cumulative effect of development if this did occur.</p>
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	<p>Southern Water advises that significant off-site sewerage infrastructure will be required to serve the strategic locations in the Maidstone Urban Area. This is the case regardless of which sites are selected. The need for this infrastructure should be identified in policy terms in the Core Strategy. This does not preclude any of the sites from future development.</p>
Air quality/noise	No issues.
Land contamination	No issues.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Flood zone 1.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few on-site constraints to development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access (particularly the narrow width of Church Road for vehicles) and difficulty of connecting to the A20 and A274.</li> <li>• Landscape character - the rural character and appearance of this site make it part of Maidstone's countryside setting.</li> <li>• Two areas of Ancient Woodland lie in relatively close proximity to the east and west site boundaries.</li> <li>• Development on site may negatively impact on the setting of Gore Court House, a Grade II* listed building.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p>

	<p>For this site to be developed, Church Lane would need to be improved sufficient to be able to take development not only from Gore Court, but also from the other sites that would need to be allocated for Gore Court to also be acceptable.</p> <p>In addition to the fact that this site cannot be allocated alone, if development were to proceed the setting of Gore Court would be irreversibly damaged and the rural character of the area changed fundamentally.</p> <p>This site is unsuitable for development.</p>
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
<p>Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	<p>The site is available for use and the information submitted from the planning agent does not indicate any issues in this respect.</p>
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
<p>Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered</p>	<p>The achievability of this site would be dependent on the allocation of land surrounding it, otherwise this would not be adjacent to the urban area.</p> <p>No immediately apparent abnormal costs however.</p>
Achievability conclusion	Negative/neutral (this relies on the allocation of other land).

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows:-</p> <p><i>'The proposed development at Gore Court would see residential units in the grounds of a grade II* listed building. The landowner has suggested that this development could fund the ongoing restoration of the building.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to the allocated sites at North of Sutton Road and North of Bicknor Wood, development at this location would see the eastern boundary of the Maidstone urban area extending further into the open countryside. Opposite the site on Church Road, the woodland is designated ancient woodland. Without the allocation of submitted sites adjacent to Gore Court, this site itself would not be adjacent to the urban area.</i></p> <p><i>Church Road is relatively restrained at this location due to its location passing through woodland and due to the narrowness of Gore Court Road to the south.</i></p>

*The wooded/parkland character at this location, combined with restricted access means that on the whole this site is unsuitable for development. This site is in principle unacceptable without the larger scale allocation of land in the area which would encompass it. The site alone is not adjacent to the existing urban area.'*

There have been no changes to the circumstances of the site such that there is no reason to reach a different conclusion.

REJECT

YIELD -0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-27
Site name/address	Land north of Howland Road Marden
Landowner	Not specified
Agent	Developer: Elliott Newlyn, Rydon Homes,
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	1.8
Proposed yield	Circa 60 residential dwellings with associated open space
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural - In countryside, adjacent to RSC - Marden village boundary
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	This level site comprises a number of scrub fields. It lies on the northern side of Howland Road and wraps round the rear (north) of a number of properties which themselves front Howland Road. The western boundary is defined with a hedge belt and to the north there is a further substantial tree belt beyond which is the railway line. The site fronts directly onto Howland Road in two places; at the western end between the properties Vine Cottage and 8 Grimwood cottages and at the eastern end between 7 Howland Cottages (listed building) and the property Bridgehurst (listed building). The site narrows towards the east; the proximity of the properties' rear gardens to the railway line creates a pinch point in the vicinity of 7 Howland Cottages.
Current use	Scrub/grazing land.
Adjacent uses	Residential properties fronting Howland Road. Railway line to the north; recreational playing field to the west.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	In countryside, adjacent to Marden village boundary (H27)  T7 Railway Land Safeguarding runs along the north of the site.
Planning history	<b>MA/13/1291:</b> Outline application for 44 dwellings comprising 5no. 1-bedroom, 9no. 2-bedroom, 17no. 3-bedroom and 13no. 4-bedroom houses together with new access, associated parking, wildlife enhancement area, and attenuation pond with access considered at this stage and all other matters reserved for future consideration: APPROVED 04/06/2014  Site allocated under Reg. 18 draft of Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2014: Policy H1(32)
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No.

<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald.</p> <p>Key characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Small fields with orchards, pasture, ponds and watercourses enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost</li> <li>• Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed for intensive arable cultivation</li> <li>• Sparse scattered small woodlands</li> <li>• Winding roads with wide verges bounded by ditches and mixed native hedgerows</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden</li> </ul> <p>Condition assessment: Good Sensitivity assessment: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land and orchards and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads and hamlets</li> <li>• Resist further linear development and intrusive elements along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul> <p>Assessment of landscape impact:</p>
--	--

	<p>There are glimpsed views of the western and eastern parts of the site from Howland Road. These views are obscured by the hedgerow boundaries fronting onto Howland Road at the western and eastern extremes of the site. There are more expansive views of the site from the minor residential road Meadow Way which runs between numbers 2 and 3 Grimwood Cottages. Longer distance views beyond and into the site are limited by the strong landscaped belts along the site's northern and western boundaries and overall the site is considered well contained in the landscape.</p> <p>The more exposed part of the site is the eastern most field which falls away slightly to the north east corner and beyond which limited views of the wider countryside to the north can be glimpsed through the tree and hedge belt bordering the site (views may be less apparent when trees are in full leaf). There are also views from Howland Road looking north westwards across this eastern field towards the main body of the site.</p> <p>Leaving Marden village along Howland Road, the end of the row of Howland Cottages does mark the point where the main core of the village gives way to more dispersed rural development. Development of the eastern most field would extend the built up area of the village on this northern side of Howland Road and could serve to link this frontage development that is associated with the property Bridgehurst.</p>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The majority of the site is rough grassland and there is an area of woodland/scrub in the North Western Corner. The site has thick hedgerows/tree line along the northern and western boundary. High potential to contain protected/notable species including dormouse, reptiles, foraging bats, GCN and badger. The site is adjacent to the railway line so there is good connectivity to the surrounding site.</p> <p>Ecology Constraint Level 2 - potential for moderate ecological impacts. (scale is 1 – 4 of which 1 is the highest level of constraint)</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p>No TPOs or ancient woodland on/adjacent to the site.</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>Mostly grade 2 agricultural land, grade 3 at the far East of the site.</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> Yeoman Cottage/ Vine Cottage (Grade II) lie immediately adjacent to the western end of the site and Bridgehurst Farmhouse (Grade II) lies immediately to the east. For the most part this part of Howland Road is almost entirely ribbon-developed, with houses of widely varying ages. There is a small break immediately next to Vine Cottage and a larger one before Bridgehurst Farmhouse. The proposed site lies largely behind</p>

	<p>frontage development with the exception of these gaps at either end. It comprises open fields, sandwiched between the houses on the road frontage and the railway line, and makes only a minor contribution to the setting of Yeoman Cottage/ Vine Cottage; however, the gap in the road frontage at the eastern end performs a more important function regarding the setting of Bridgehurst Farmhouse and its associated former farm buildings where it preserves their rural character. Careful development of the site, but omitting this eastern section, might be able to be achieved without significant damage being caused to the settings of listed buildings.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Archaeology:</b> No known implications.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>Site lies adjacent to historic farm complex of Bridgehurst Farm. It also lies immediately south of historic WWII pipeline, PLUTO.</p> <p>Scale 4 - Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.</p>
PROW (within or near site)	No.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties in Marden.</li> <li>• Potential for access from Howland Road and/or Meadow Way.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the B2079 High Street via Howland Road, which has a relatively good crash record and a continuous footway link to the village centre.</li> <li>• All of the village services within Marden, including the railway station – which is served by half-hourly train services to Ashford, Staplehurst, Paddock Wood, Tonbridge and London Charing Cross – are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on High Street are served by Bus Route 26, which provides a service to Maidstone, Yalding and Goudhurst every two hours on weekdays.</li> <li>• It is recommended that Network Rail be consulted on this site given the proximity of the Ashford-Tonbridge railway line.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Existing pavement access from the western end of the site towards the centre of the village.</p> <p>Station: 0.5 miles  Shops: 0.2 miles  GP: 0.5 miles  School: 0.7 miles</p>

<p>Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)</p>	<p>Whilst the site lies to the rear of a number of properties, it is separated from the properties themselves by the distance of their rear gardens and the width of a rear access road that runs behind them. Development should be able to proceed without undue impact on these premises.</p> <p>The site fronts onto Howland Road at two points and development would need to be planned to avoid overlooking and undue disturbance to the properties which sit on either side of these stretches of frontage (namely Vine Cottage, 8 Grimwood Cottages, 7 Howland Cottages and Bridgehurst).</p> <p>There is no formal public access across the site. The site does appear to be used informally by local residents for dog walking etc.</p>
<p>Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric</p>	<p>The developer has confirmed that gas, electricity, water (supply and foul) and telecoms are available.</p>
<p>Air quality/noise</p>	<p>The site is not in an AQMA and not in a hotspot. There will be some noise disturbance from the railway line. This should be mitigated, as necessary, by supplementing the existing landscape buffer along the site’s northern boundary.</p>
<p>Land contamination</p>	<p>None known.</p>
<p>Flood Risk (zone/drainage)</p>	<p>Surface runoff from all sites should be managed using sustainable drainage techniques, with discharge restricted to no more than runoff from the existing site following the critical rainfall events for a range of return periods, up to an including the 100yr event. An allowance for climate change should also be included the drainage design.</p> <p>Marden and Harrietsham Drainage Strategy: We recommend a local drainage strategy be developed into which all the sites should contribute to, rather than each site considering site drainage independently. A local drainage strategy will likely result in a more efficient local drainage infrastructure.</p>
<p>Suitability (assessment conclusion)</p>	<p>This site is considered suitable for residential development subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retention of the significant, established landscape buffers along the site boundaries</li> <li>• Enhancement of these buffers, as required, to mitigate railway noise</li> <li>• Assessment of the ecological value of the site and the identification of appropriate measures to retain and enhance its ecological value, alongside mitigation measures if required.</li> <li>• The siting of development to preserve the setting of Yeoman Cottage/Vine Cottage</li> <li>• Development of the eastern part of the site only being acceptable of this can be achieved whilst preserving the setting of listed property Bridgehurst and minimising wider landscape impact.</li> </ul>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Site in single ownership with current developer interest (Rydon Homes) and a planning application that was approved on 4 June 2014
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent Need for an appropriate ecological mitigation area
Achievability conclusion	Achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this time period
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning permission has now been granted for 44 dwellings on this site under application MA/13/1291 on 4 June 2014.</li> <li>The site has an allocation under Policy H1(32) of the Reg. 18 consultation draft of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2014.</li> <li>The policy needs to be amended to reflect the extant planning permission and the associated safeguarded mitigation and receptor sites at the eastern end of the site.</li> </ul>	
ACCEPT	
YIELD - 44	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-30
Site name/address	Elizabeth House, Grigg Lane
Landowner	Angus Stewart
Agent	Angus Stewart
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.4
Proposed yield	Either 4 dwellings, 10-12 "starter homes", retirement homes, or a mix.
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Approximately rectangular site extending northwards from rear of Elizabeth House. Site is level and in use for grassland/rough pasture. Surrounded by agricultural land to north and east; to west and east by a recent residential development, to south and east by residential properties. Site boundaries marked by native hedges with some mature trees. The site is level. Existing access to Grigg Lane via Elizabeth House.
Current use	Agricultural, rough grassland/pasture.
Adjacent uses	Agricultural, residential (including doctors surgery).
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside Low Weald Special Landscape Area MBWLP 2000 ENV34.
Planning history	13/1943: Outline planning application for the erection of a children's' nursery school, 20 residential units (comprising 17 detached, semi-detached and terraced houses and 3 bungalows) and provision of a children's' play area together with off-site highway improvements to the junction of Oak Lane and Wheeler Street (A274). Approval is sought for access, appearance, layout and scale with landscaping as a reserved matter: RESOLUTION TO GRANT subject to completion of s106 Agreement  This includes part of the currently proposed site.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Accepted in 2009 SHLAA (124).
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Would be isolated from the village of Headcorn, but located within an existing area of residential and commercial ribbon development to the north and south of Grigg Lane immediately adjacent to a recent development of 25 dwellings, doctors' surgery/pharmacy and nursery school.  Landscape Character Area 43: Headcorn Pastureland Key characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the</li> </ul>

	<p>Low Weald</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Good Sensitivity Assessment = High Guidelines- Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and hedgerows to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land use and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along Maidstone Road</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	Grass field with mature trees within the boundary and at the rear of the site. Suitable habitat within the site limited to the boundary and the rear of the site. There are records for GCN, bats and reptiles within the surrounding area so they may be present within the site.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	Along boundaries; none protected or registered.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Not applicable.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Not applicable.
PROW (within or near site)	KH 606 approximately 100m to west.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grigg Lane is an unclassified highway, national speed limit. Highways improvements including lighting and provision of pavements westwards of Doctors surgery have been secured by way of S106.</li> <li>• Site situated within close proximity of the Headcorn village boundary.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Grigg Lane.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing, subject to constraints. It enjoys good access to the A274 primary route via Grigg Lane and Oak Lane, which have a good crash record, although the eastward extension of the 30mph speed limit beyond the site access may be required. However, forward visibility is poor in places, the road passes close to residential properties and it is not wide enough for two large vehicles to pass. These constraints may limit the quantum of development that can be achieved on this site and appropriate mitigation may be required if proven necessary though the submission of a Transport Assessment.</li> <li>• The site is within walking and cycling distance of many of the residential properties and services in Headcorn village, although the footway on Grigg Lane would need to be extended to the site access.</li> <li>• The site is also in relatively close proximity to both the A274, served by Bus Route 12, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone and Tenterden on weekdays, and Headcorn Station, which is served by half-hourly train services to Ashford, Staplehurst, Paddock Wood, Tonbridge and London Charing Cross.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Headcorn village centre (approximately 0.65km). New doctors surgery and school located immediately to west.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Site abuts 1 adjacent residential property (applicant).
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Relatively remote, but likely to be some services as there are other isolated properties in the vicinity, and a housing development immediately to the south west of the site.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue.
Land contamination	Unlikely
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zone 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>Part of the submitted area (part of site A) has been subject to a planning application MA/13/1943. The has been considered by the Planning Committee and Members have resolved to grant planning permission subject to the prior completion of a s106 legal agreement. The agreement is (as of 13/10/2014) imminently nearing completion.</p> <p>Given this, it is considered that circumstances have changed and that site A should be allocated for development, largely to reflect recent planning history.</p> <p>However, it is considered that site B (closest to Elizabeth House) should not be allocated for development given the relationship of this area of land to the house.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Whole site is available Willing developer (Wealden Homes) have secured a resolution to grant permission on part of the submitted area
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows:</p> <p><i>'Would represent a relatively isolated development in the open countryside, and located in a relatively unsustainable location. It would be visually intrusive and harmful to the character of the open countryside in this location. REJECT'</i></p> <p>In my view there has been a significant material change in circumstances relating to the site since the previous assessment</p> <p>Part of the submitted area (part of site A) has been subject to a planning application MA/13/1943. This has been considered by the Planning Committee and Members have resolved to grant planning permission subject to the prior completion of a s106 legal agreement. The agreement is (as of 13/10/2014) imminently nearing completion.</p> <p>Given this, it is considered that circumstances have changed and that the site should be allocated for development, largely to reflect recent planning history. The approved development proposes bungalows on this part of the site. It is considered that this type of development/unit is appropriate given the fact that the site is adjacent to undeveloped countryside.</p> <p>Access should only be from within the recently approved adjacent development.</p> <p>ACCEPT- Yield -3</p> <p>However do not allocate as already has planning permission and site is too small.</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-39
Site name/address	Iden Park, Cranbrook Road
Landowner	Mr B A Matthews
Agent	Mr D Pares: Sibley Pares
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	2.8
Proposed yield	85
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to village.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites.

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site comprises an approximately level triangular parcel of land to the south and east of the village of Staplehurst. The land is managed (grazed) open parkland of considerable visual amenity with a great number of mature Oaks within the site boundary; some of these appear to be arranged in circular patterns. Site is screened by mature native hedges to all boundaries, these are of mixed quality in respect of their screening value; Part of the west and north boundaries are screened by existing commercial and residential buildings. The KM309 and KM308 run along the south and east boundaries of the site respectively. A water course runs through the centre of the site. Mature trees (worthy of TPO) likely to be significant constraint on development.
Current use	White land; open parkland formerly associated with Iden Manor.
Adjacent uses	Agricultural to north, south, west and east, residential to west, petrol station with outline planning permission for residential to west. Tennis and cricket club to north and east.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	The site is located in open countryside designated as being within the Low Weald Special Landscape Area.
Planning history	MA/91/0007 Agricultural access – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS  MA/84/1594 Change of use to tennis club – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (north of site only)
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Rejected in 2009 SHLAA (136).
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Would extend Staplehurst to the south and east, not visually logical in relationship to existing village. Despite existing hedge screening, would be visible in the streetscene and approach to the village.  Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald

	<p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land and orchards and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads and hamlets</li> <li>• Resist further linear development and intrusive elements along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>This site has been identified as a BAP Habitat (Wood Pasture Parkland). The site is a grassland site with scattered trees and is surrounded by hedgerows or mature trees. In the South West corner there is a strip of woodland with a pond. There is a potential of bats, reptiles and GCN being present.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p>Whilst the trees on the site are not currently protected there appear to be trees which merit protection by a TPO, namely blocks of trees to the west of the site (and northern tip) together with prominent individuals on boundaries and near the watercourse crossing the site. Some TPO'd trees in close proximity to north east boundary of the site.</p>

Agricultural land quality	Grade 3.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>Historic Buildings: There would be negligible impact on any listed buildings.</p> <p>Conservation Areas: The site lies close to the southern boundary of the Staplehurst Conservation Area and development of this site would be likely to have some impact on its setting by extending the built-up area out into open countryside.</p> <p>Historic Parks and Gardens: Although not a registered site, Iden Park, within which this site lies, is of local importance and should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The parkland probably dates from the 1840s onwards, developed in connection with the Hoare family's occupation of Staplehurst House (now Staplehurst Manor) and later Iden Manor itself, built further to the south in 1887/8. This land still has a parkland character and development of it would be harmful to the park as a whole.</p> <p>Archaeology: No known implications but the proximity of the line of the Roman road means that there may be potential for finds/ features associated with it.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Adjacent to Roman Road alignment.
PROW (within or near site)	KM309 and KM308 run along the south and east boundaries of the site.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Significant site adjacent to the Total petrol station. Current access is from Frittenden Lane but site could be accessed directly from the A229.</p> <p>To be acceptable from a highways perspective a new site access onto the A229 with excellent visibility splays and as far away from the petrol station as possible would be required.</p> <p>Access to public transport and services is acceptable.</p> <p>The crash record for this stretch of the A229 is ok, with 5 slight incidents in the last 5 years, but the junction between the A229 and Frittenden Lane is of more concern and therefore the site access should be as far as possible from Frittenden Lane.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Staplehurst village centre (approximately 0.75km), railway station approximately 1k.6`m.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Site abuts 1 adjacent residential property.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Reasonable, as in close proximity to settlement boundary of Staplehurst.
Air quality/noise	Not applicable.
Land contamination	Not applicable.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not applicable.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site would appear as a contrived extension to the RSC, and its development would be detrimental to the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area. The site has a strong parkland character as a result of its association with Iden Manor and the presence of large numbers of

	protected and non-protected trees of considerable size and age, the loss of which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside. Although not in a zone recorded by the EA as being prone to flood, several watercourses run through the site and there is likely to be a need for ecological mitigation in the event of development of the land.
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Site is available. Millwood Homes are named as an interested developer
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<p><i>'Overall conclusions inc.</i>  <i>The site would appear as a contrived extension to the RSC, and its development would be detrimental to the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area. The site has a strong parkland character as a result of its association with Iden Manor and the presence of large numbers of protected and non-protected trees of considerable size and age, the loss of which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside. Although not in a zone recorded by the EA as being prone to flood, several watercourses run through the site and there is likely to be a need for ecological mitigation in the event of development of the land.'</i></p>	
There has been no material change in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment to warrant a different conclusion being reached .	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-44
Site name/address	Vicarage Field, Linton
Landowner	Alan Firmin Ltd
Agent	DHA Planning
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	1.92
Proposed yield	24 dwellings at 30dpha
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	This site is a ploughed agricultural field, with land levels rising towards the centre and falling towards the edges. It lies in a Special Landscape Area and partly within Linton Conservation Area. There is some overgrown, vacant land to the north with a large orchard towards its western side. To the south and west are mainly dwellings. There are also some allotments to the south. The site is an important visual gap giving fine long distance views to a ridge many miles beyond. It lies upon a main arterial route, the A229, into Maidstone.
Current use	Agricultural
Adjacent uses	Some residential
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Special Landscape Area, partly Conservation Area.
Planning history	None.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Yes, and was found to be unsuitable. Inspector concluded housing here would cause visual harm and be unsustainable.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>The site is an important visual gap, which is highly visible from the road and public footpath network. It makes a strong, positive contribution to the open character and scenic quality of the Special Landscape Area, particularly because of the topography in this area. The consolidation of built development in this area would cause substantial harm to that important scenic quality and open character.</p> <p>It is estimated that the dwellings shown in the suggested layout (confining residential development to the western side of the site) would still be clearly visible in long range views, because of the topography and the introduction of woodland would be out of character with what one would expect to see upon this generally open ridge.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area Assessment: Landscape Character Area 38: Yalding Farmlands</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Reservoirs and water bodies along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drains running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Frequent orchards</li> <li>• Parkland landscape surrounding Hunton Court</li> <li>• Historic settlement of Yalding</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment Very Good Sensitivity Assessment High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve orchards and the traditional small scale field pattern</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of existing development</li> <li>• Conserve the historic parkland landscape around Hunton Park</li> <li>• Conserve the rural setting of traditional buildings and farmhouses</li> <li>• Conserve distinctive ragstone walling</li> <li>• Conserve the undeveloped character of the landscape</li> <li>• Resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Avoid linear infill development along roads</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>Unlikely to be significant as site is a ploughed field.</p> <p>KCC Ecological Officer comments: "Intensively managed orchard which is surrounded by hedgerows. Ecological constraints level 4. Some suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site."</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>Landscape Officer comments: Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 21 of 1976 protects 2 individual trees on the northern site boundary. There appear to be other significant boundary trees worthy of retention on the eastern and southern (eastern extent) boundaries. There are no designated Ancient Woodlands. The hedgerow to the north of the site may be 'important'.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 3.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>Conservation Officer comments: "No listed buildings affected. 19<sup>th</sup> Century estate cottages to the south of the site make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area and should be considered as non-designated heritage assets. Development of the site would potentially adversely affect their setting.</p>

	<p>The eastern half of the site lies within the Linton Conservation Area. This area of open farmland penetrating into the village street is an important feature which is identified in the approved Conservation Area Appraisal. I therefore do not consider that development of this site is appropriate.</p> <p>The site lies opposite the registered historic parkland of Linton Park.”</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	KCC Archaeological Advisor comments: “Site adjacent to Linton Park EH Registered Parkland Grade II. Significant archaeology could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval”
PROW (within or near site)	KM137 lies to north of site
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Access is on to A229 main road. Public transport is easily available, as the site lies on a bus route, with stops within easy walking distance.</p> <p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties within Linton.</li> <li>• Site accessed from the A229 Linton Hill.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys direct access to the A229 primary route, which has a good crash record, although the nearby A229/B2163 Heath Road junction has a relatively poor crash record.</li> <li>• The site is within walking and cycling distance of the services within Linton and parts of Loose. (Services in the vicinity are very limited).</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus Route 5 serves the A229 Linton Hill, providing an hourly service to Maidstone, Staplehurst, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst on weekdays. (However, very limited facilities in close proximity).</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Some potential road noise from A229.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Utilities run along the A229, existing development in the area . No problems expected.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue
Land contamination	Unlikely to cause significant harm, subject to an appropriate layout etc.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zone 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Unsuitable due to harmful visual impact and unsustainable.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner Now also a willing developer (Countryside Properties)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'The development of this site would cause significant visual harm to the open character and scenic quality of the Special Landscape Area and would erode an important visual gap and unacceptably consolidate built development in important long range views. The site makes a strong positive contribution to the Open Character of the Special Landscape Area, particularly due to the topography of the area, with fine long distance views across the site to a ridge many miles beyond.</i></p> <p><i>This site has previously been rejected at Local Plan Inquiry on the grounds of visual harm and unsustainable. There is also a potential heritage impact in terms of the Conservation Area which covers part of the site. Also it is considered unsustainable as there are insufficient facilities in the vicinity. It is, therefore, considered unsuitable.'</i></p> <p>Unlike when the site was previously assessed, there is now a developer interested in developing the site.</p> <p>However, the physical location of the site and considerations relating to its development has not changed in the interim period. The conclusions expressed above remain relevant.</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-52
Site name/address	Hockers Farm, Orchard View, Detling
Landowner	Mr C. & Mr R. Dale
Agent	Ashfold Estates
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.85
Proposed yield	12 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to Detling village boundary (MBWLP 2000).
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Gentle rising slope north, paddocks, west borders gardens, to the east are agricultural fields.
Current use	Paddocks.
Adjacent uses	Residential, agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside AONB SLA Strategic Gap Public Open Space
Planning history	MA/13/0256 - An application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for existing development being use of land and stables within land marked 'A' in breach of conditions 3 and 7 of application MA/99/0949 for a period in excess of 10 years, and use of land and building – under consideration.  2002 and 2004 planning applications for residential development have been refused.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	'Hockers Farm' was considered by the Inspector and whilst unclear of the exact site, the Inspector did conclude to not modify the Plan in response to these objections.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 14-2: Thurnham Farmlands  KEY CHARACTERISTICS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large arable fields across undulating land</li> <li>• Pockets of smaller fields and paddocks around settlements</li> <li>• Mixed woodland blocks</li> <li>• Historic settlements recognised as Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Large isolated farmsteads and estates</li> <li>• Narrow lanes with hedgerow boundaries</li> </ul> Condition Assessment - Good Sensitivity Assessment - High Guidelines: CONSERVE

	<p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Gault Clay Vale</li> <li>• Thurnham Farmlands are situated within the Kent Downs AONB. The AONB is a nationally important designation which offers a high level of development constraint</li> <li>• Land management policies for the conservation management and enhancement of this landscape are set out within the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2009-2014</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments from Kent Downs AONB Unit</u>  <i>"Full development of this area would challenge the character of Detling village. Object to full release of this land Exception site for small number of affordable homes acceptable. Scale, form, layout exceptional quality needed. Treatment of AONB edge paramount.</i></p> <p><i>Challenge to traditional orchards Challenge to village edge to open landscape of AONB to the east. Recreational pressures on agricultural land adjoining should be understood and addressed."</i></p>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p><u>KCC Biodiversity Officer advice -</u></p> <p><i>"A derelict orchard with rough grassland. Potential for the site to be suitable for roosting bats, breeding birds, GCN and reptiles. The site is within 1km of the North Down Woodlands SAC and Wouldham to Detling Escarpment SSSI - due to the size of the site, on it's on it may have reduced potential to impact the designated site. However there are a number of allocated sites in the immediate area and in combination these site may have a big impact."</i></p> <p><b>Constraints Level 2 –</b></p> <p>Potential for moderate ecological impacts.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	No significant issues.
Agricultural land quality	AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION - GRADE 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	No issues.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	SCALE 3 - Neolithic flints and earthworks have been recorded to the north and Iron Age and Romano-British remains noted to the south and west. Similar remains may extend into the site.
PROW (within or near site)	None
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated to the rear of existing residential properties in Detling.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Orchard View.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the A249 via Hockers Lane and The Street, which have a relatively good crash record and a continuous footway link to the village centre and bus stops.</li> </ul>

transport/walking/cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All of the village services within Detling are within walking or cycling distance of the site and The Street is served by Bus Routes 333 and 334, which provide a combined half-hourly service to Maidstone and Sittingbourne, with onward connections to Faversham and Sheerness respectively.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site is 1.9km from the nearest medical hub/GP.</li> <li>- Site is 2.9km from nearest secondary school.</li> <li>- Site is 2.1km from nearest primary school.</li> <li>- The site is 235m from the nearest sports facility.</li> <li>- The site is 1.7km from the nearest play space.</li> <li>- The site is adjacent to green space.</li> <li>- The site is 1.7km from the nearest bus stop.</li> <li>- The site is 1.8km from the nearest train station.</li> <li>- The site is 509m from the nearest cycle route.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Nothing significant that could not be addressed through appropriate design.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Close to other residential properties and roads, so it is likely that connection to utilities would be possible.
Air quality/noise	M20 hotspot nearby Adjacent to AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue
Land contamination	Not on or within 250m of landfill site.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in flood zones 2 or 3 No significant issues.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Suitable for housing – extension to existing cul-de-sac

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner and developer.
Availability conclusion	Available.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	No obvious constraints to the provision of the development.
Achievability conclusion	Achievable.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The previous assessment concluded as follows

*'The site is reasonably well related to the existing pattern of development within Detling village. It would see an extension of the residential cul-de-sac Orchard View further into the countryside in a southerly direction and it would see the removal of the existing agricultural buildings on site.*

*There would be clear views of the site from private garden land and footpaths to the east. Also more long ranging views from Pilgrims Way; these however would see the site with the backdrop of existing residential development.*

*The site relies upon car borne travel, even bus stops are not within easy walking distance. The village itself has limited amenities raising issues of sustainability. It is unlikely that there would be any significant ecology concerns on this site.*

*The land is not, due to its location, surroundings and relationship with other agricultural land to be considered of high value for agricultural use (notwithstanding its grade).*

*In order to achieve a significant landscape buffer around the perimeter of the site, it is considered that a realistic yield would be for 6 dwellings.*

*On balance, given that the site does not accord with the agreed spatial distribution and sits within the AONB the site is recommended to be rejected.'*

Since the previous assessment there has been no change in the material circumstances of the site to warrant a different conclusion being reached. The Post Office has closed since the previous assessment meaning that Detling now only has a church, village hall and pub.

REJECT

YIELD- 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma – 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-55
Site name/address	Cross Keys
Landowner	Not known
Agent	Guy Osborne – Country House Developments Ltd
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	4.86 (total site) 2.89 ha (development area)
Proposed yield	50 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to the urban area.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site comprises a strip of land located to the east of Crosskeys to the west of Sutton Street and to the south of The Street/Roundwell. The site borders to urban boundary and is within a countryside location.</p> <p>The site has a flat area plateau area running through the middle with the river. To the west of this the land rises sharply in places to its boundary with Crosskeys and to the east this a gentle rise the rear of the properties within Sutton Street.</p> <p>The land is largely not maintained and includes areas of established grassland and established trees and planting.</p> <p>This area largely comprises residential properties and has a more rural character than the urban boundary of Bearsted to the west of the site.</p> <p>The site also includes two areas of lock-up garages on Cross Keys</p>
Current use	The land is currently rough grassland and it appears that parts are used for grazing of horses.
Adjacent uses	<p>There is an existing residential development to the west of the site which lies within the urban boundary of Maidstone. To the east of the street is a line of residential properties lining Sutton Street.</p> <p>To the south and south east of the site, some land is used for grazing of horses.</p>
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	<p>Countryside location Within Special Landscape Area Adjacent to Area of Local Landscape Importance</p> <p><b>Kent Downs AONB response:-</b> Care with layout, orientation, design and landscaping of edge. Impact on views from AONB scarp need assessing</p>

<p>Planning history</p>	<p>There is some planning history at this site. Including 1972 and 1967 applications for residential development which were refused. The remaining permissions concern development for the raising of levels within the site.</p> <p>67/0284/MK3 – Refused 72/0035/MK3 – Refused 88/1670 – Refused 89/0469 - Refused</p>
<p>Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation</p>	<p>Considered within the SHLAA 2009.</p>
<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site falls within character area 49-1 – Caring Pastures</li> <li>2. Key Characteristics (blue box) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban edge influences and suburban land uses</li> <li>• Frequent small woodland clumps</li> <li>• Pasture</li> <li>• Medium sized fields</li> <li>• Undulating topography</li> <li>• Dominance of road infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. From Summary of Analysis Box <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condition Assessment = Poor</li> <li>• Sensitivity Assessment = Low</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Guideline = Improve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Valleys.</li> <li>• Create a new functional integrity in which the use of the land is reflected in clear landscape features. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve historic parkland features</li> <li>• Improve the more distinctive and characteristic elements, e.g. native woodland, which strengthen the setting of the Kent Downs AONB</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Avoid urban fringe influences extending along the A20</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site has some ecological value.</p> <p><b>KCC Ecology Response</b> - There are a variety of different habitats within the site. The site consists of woodland, rough grassland, scattered scrub, grassland fields and an unmanaged traditional orchard. Potential for protected/notable species to be present - particularly within the woodlands and the rough grassland to the SW, west and NW of the site. Species include roosting bats, reptiles, GCN, dormice. (2)</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p><b>Tree protection status:</b> Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 20 of 1995 protects Major’s Wood to the south of the site and the south western tip is adjacent to the</p>

	<p>Conservation area.</p> <p>Whilst the trees on the site itself are not currently protected there appears to be woodland to the west which is worthy of a TPO together with mature trees within the northern and the south southeastern portions of the site which may merit protection.</p> <p><b>Ancient woodlands</b> (<i>from ' a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone Borough, August 2012'</i>) There are no designated Ancient Woodlands in or adjacent to the site.</p> <p><b>Hedgerow status:</b> There may be remnants of old hedgerows marking the historic field pattern.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4 and 5
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> A number of listed buildings lie close to this site. Those most affected would be Gore Cottage, Sutton House and barn in Sutton Street and Cross Keys Cottage. Gore Cottage and Sutton House currently enjoy a largely rural setting which is an important contributor to their significance; this setting would be lost by development of this site. Cross Keys Cottage, whilst having a more built-up setting, would nevertheless be affected by the loss of its open outlook over the site.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> The site touches the boundary of the Bearsted (Holy Cross) Conservation Area at its south-western tip. An important part of the character of the Conservation Area is the feeling that it is at the edge of development, with open countryside beyond. This would be compromised by development of the site which would effectively join together the historically separate settlements of Bearsted and Sutton Street. The approved Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for Bearsted identified this site as having potential for further study with a view to possible designation as an extension to the conservation area.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> No historic parks or gardens would be affected.</p> <p><b>Archaeology:</b> The western part of the site is occupied by the important archaeological remains associated with the moated site of the medieval Mott Hall and its associated fishponds and dams. Mott Hall was one of the original manorial sites of Bearsted and originally belonged to Leeds Priory. Although not a Scheduled Ancient Monument, this archaeological site is of considerable importance and should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The fishpond and dam are particularly visible features in the landscape. Even if development were</p>

	<p>to be carried out so as to avoid direct interference with archaeological remains, their setting would be irreparably damaged.</p> <p><b>Other Comments:</b> There are strong heritage objections to development of this site.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p><b>KCC Archaeology Response:-</b> Land contains the site of Mott Hall, a medieval/post medieval manor complex with associated historic landscape including pond bay and earthworks.</p> <p>Officer comment Since the previous assessment the applicants have undertaken archaeological work. This has informed the on-going site layout and design work</p>
PROW (within or near site)	Footpath KM75 runs along the very southern boundary of the site, but would not preclude any development in itself.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p><b>KCC Highways Response:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties within Bearsted.</li> <li>• Potential for access from Roundwell and/or Cross Keys.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the A20 Ashford Road via Roundwell, which has a good crash record. A continuous footway link to the centre of Bearsted is provided on Roundwell.</li> <li>• All of the services within Bearsted are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site, including the railway station, which is served by half-hourly train services to Ashford, Maidstone, Bromley South and London Victoria on weekdays.</li> <li>• The nearby bus stops on Roundwell are served by Bus Route 19, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 750m of Bearsted Rail Station</li> <li>• The Street/Roundwell is served by a bus service with the site located 100m from a bus stop.</li> <li>• Local shop/butchers and local pub within 600m.</li> <li>• Primary schools and GP surgery within 1.5km.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	There would be limited impact upon existing residential amenity of properties within Crosskeys. Depending on residential layout, may be a loss of privacy/overlooking to rear of properties within Sutton Street.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	No existing utilities exist within site. However, utilities exist within main road and access to this could be obtained.
Air quality/noise	Adjacent to AQMA, but no issues raised.
Land contamination	No issues raised.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Flood zone 2/3

	<p>The central part of the site following the path of the river Len is highlighted as potential for flooding. This amounts to a significant amount of the site.</p> <p>Officer comment          Since the previous assessment the applicants have undertaken detailed flood assessment work that has been assessed in conjunction with the Environment Agency. The results of this work have been used in defining the area to be developed and the site layout.</p>
<p>Suitability (assessment conclusion)</p>	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Good access to public transport and highway network.</li> <li>• Good access to local services.</li> <li>• Provide good level of housing yield.</li> <li>• Immediate area to west of urban residential character</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semi-rural and historic character of existing site – Conservation objection/landscape objection.</li> <li>• Provides significant landscape and ecology quality.</li> <li>• Area of Local Landscape Importance.</li> <li>• Flood zone 2/3 – River Len running through site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u>          The site is considered appropriate for development. It is within a sustainable location with good accessibility and position in relation to the surrounding developed areas.</p> <p>The further work that the applicants have undertaken have confirmed the flood risk and provided more detailed assessment of archaeological impact.</p>

<p><b>3. AVAILABILITY</b></p>	
<p>Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	<p>Site is available          Willing developer that have had extensive pre-application discussions and undertaken significant work prior to submission a revised application</p>
<p>Availability conclusion</p>	<p>Available</p>

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	<p>The site has archaeological and flood risk issues associated with it.</p> <p>The potential applicant has expended significant resources hitherto seeking to address these issues.</p> <p>There is no reason to indicate that these issues cannot be resolved</p>
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows  'Following the consideration of the issues raised above, the sustainable location and its close relationship to the urban residential area to the west, I consider that the site is suitable for development.</p> <p>The site has some landscape importance locally and includes a number of established trees and planting, particularly concentrated to the western side of the site. This site also forms an important transitional space between the urban area of Bearsted to the west and the less developed area of Cross Keys to the east. As such, care would need to be taken in any design to ensure key elements of the character of this area are retained. The River Len also flows through this site and so the residential layout would need to allow sufficient spacing for this to mitigate the flood risk.</p> <p>Similarly, the density of any residential development would need to be appropriate to be sympathetic to this character. Our development matrix indicates a density of 35dph for a site in this urban periphery location. However, due to the transitional character of this site and its existing constraints which are present to the western side of the site, I consider that a density of 30dph would be more appropriate.</p> <p>As such, I recommend that the site is accepted for development.'</p> <p>The applicant has since undertaken significant archaeological and flood assessment work (on the Lilk Stream....not the River Len as previously concluded) and refined the site layout further as a result. Whilst the site was rejected at Cabinet due to the flood risk, extensive work has since been undertaken on this issue and the Environment Agency have indicated that they are content with the work.</p> <p>The land to the west of the site in Cross Keys itself has been added following discussion with Golding Homes and will enable some of the affordable housing provision to be made on this land.</p> <p>The layout has been revised as result of these streams of work.</p> <p>The site is therefore considered to be an acceptable one for development.</p> <p>ACCEPT</p> <p>YIELD - 50 dwellings</p>



## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-58
Site name/address	South of Eythorne Street, Hollingbourne
Landowner	Keith Abrehart is client (and possibly the landowner)
Agent	DHA Planning
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield – adjacent (north of) built envelope of Hollingbourne village
Site area (ha)	1.4
Proposed yield	In region of 25-30 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Countryside adjacent (north of) built envelope of Hollingbourne village
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites submission

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>This flat field/pasture land is located in the countryside and a SLA, but also in between the built up areas of Hollingbourne village which are spread either side of the substantially raised railway line – to the south, Hollingbourne has a designated village envelope.</p> <p>This land is on the south-east side of the B2163 Eythorne Street, with its 60m frontage between the small residential cul-de-sac of Claygate and the 2* listed residential property of Godfrey House. This frontage has an established tree/hedge line.</p> <p>Its rear (south-east) boundary consists of dense tall vegetation but its south boundary only low vegetation. There are open fields and pasture land to the rear, and to the south these rise quite steeply. A public footpath KH198 runs quite close behind these boundaries. Much further south-eastwards on higher land is public footpath KH200</p>
Current use	Field/pasture.
Adjacent uses	Residential properties adjacent to south- west and north-east. Fields/pasture adjacent to east and south-east.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside and part of North Downs Special Landscape Area
Planning history	A 1960s application for residential development was withdrawn.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Prominent views from the public footpaths to the east and south-east including at further distance on higher ground. These views would only be partially interrupted by various intervening field boundaries. The site could also be exposed from Eythorne Street if developed, as access would need to be from that road. Any development would be in part against the backdrop of the existing houses on adjacent land either side, but only nearer the road frontage.

	<p>Further east the development would encroach out into the open countryside. The development of this site would therefore cause harm to the character of the countryside and SLA on this basis and especially given that it would be exposed from public views from those public footpaths to the east and south-east. There is no similar housing set back that far from Eyhorne Street and as such the development would be incongruous and visually intrusive to the landscape here.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area 15: Eyhorne Vale KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape to north of the railway line is situated within the Kent Downs AONB</li> <li>• Mixed woodland belts and blocks</li> <li>• Willow trees mark the location of drains and ditches</li> <li>• Narrow lanes which generally run against the contours south west to north east</li> <li>• Distinctive brick railway bridges</li> <li>• Major infrastructure routes along the south western periphery</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment Good Sensitivity Assessment High Guidelines – Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions Consider the generic guidelines for the Gault Clay Vales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North of the railway line, the landscape is situated within the Kent Downs AONB. The Kent Downs AONB is a nationally important designation which offers a high level of development constraint</li> <li>• Land management policies for the conservation, management and enhancement of this landscape are set out within the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2009 – 2014. Also refer to guidance documents referenced in Appendix A</li> <li>• Conserve the undeveloped foreground and rural setting of the Kent Downs AONB</li> <li>• Conserve distinctive brick railway arches and maintain using like for like materials</li> <li>• Avoid screening with coniferous planting</li> <li>• Conserve characteristic oak, ash and beech hedgerow trees and isolated oaks within arable land, and plant new hedgerow trees and isolated specimens to replace ageing examples</li> <li>• Conserve distinctive willow trees along watercourses</li> <li>• Conserve the traditional setting of listed buildings and soften the impact of recent farm buildings through native planting</li> <li>• Avoid infill development and expansion across the downland at Harrietsham and Hollingbourne</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to	Low to medium potential with long grass fields/pasture.

site)	
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	None that are protected, although there is existing vegetation and/or trees/hedgerow around the boundaries of the site.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 3
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	The site lies directly adjacent to Godfrey House, a Grade II* Listed Building. This building currently enjoys a largely rural setting, although the gap between the formerly separate settlements of Eyhorne Street and Upper Street has been closed considerably by 20 <sup>th</sup> Century developments. Development of this parcel of land would effectively complete the linkage of Eyhorne Street to Godfrey House and remove the last component of the rural setting on this side of the road which is important to the listed building. I therefore consider that development of this site would adversely affect the setting of this important Grade II* listed house.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Land to south of 16th century Godfrey House and in general area with prehistoric, romano-British and Anglo Saxon potential.
PROW (within or near site)	KH198 runs behind the eastern boundaries of the site and KH200 on higher land to the south-east.
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>The site is considered suitable for housing, subject to access constraints. It enjoys good access to the A20 Ashford Road via Eyhorne Street, which has a good crash record, although there is a poor crash record at its junction with the A20. Visibility splays at the Eyhorne Street/Hollingbourne Station access road are poor and the station access road is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass without encroaching on to the highway verge. A continuous footway link to Hollingbourne village centre is provided on Eyhorne Street.</p> <p>All of the village services within Hollingbourne are within walking and cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on Eyhorne Street are served by Bus Route 13, which provides a service to Maidstone every two hours on weekdays. The site is also adjacent to Hollingbourne Station, which is served by hourly trains to Ashford International, Maidstone East and London Victoria on weekdays.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Public transport links are provided by the adjacent railway route to nearby main towns and villages that provide the usual facilities and services. There is also a primary school several minutes walk away on Eyhorne Street.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Close neighbours adjacent to the south-west and north-east but development could be designed so as to protect their amenity.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Near to existing development and road/rail so good potential for services.
Air quality/noise	Noise and pollution from close by railway and B2163. Not in an AQMA
Land contamination	Unlikely

Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zones 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Any development would be visible from public vantage points, and therefore has the potential to result in visual harm to the countryside and SLA unless restricted to a small parcel of the site near the Eyhorne Street road frontage. Subject to that, development may be acceptable. Development of the whole site would not be suitable, however, because of the resulting encroachment into the countryside.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner Interest from an un-named developer
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this time period
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Any development would be visible from public vantage points, and therefore has the potential to result in visual harm to the countryside and SLA unless restricted to a small parcel of the site near the Eyhorne Street road frontage. Subject to that, development t may be acceptable. Over the whole site, however, encroaching into the countryside as any development would, I conclude that site is not suitable.'</i>	
This site was actually considered in two assessments under the previous SHLAA call for sites.	
HO-96 (The field immediately fronting Eyhorne Street and adjacent to Godfrey House). This site was eventually allocated under the draft local plan under policy H1(49) for 10 dwellings.	
This site HO-58 includes the frontage site but also an additional field to the E/SE of the now allocated site. The proposers have undertaken further work on a possible development solution for the larger site and have submitted a site assessment and illustrative scheme. The scheme indicates a potential development of 25-30 units on the whole (larger) site.	

However, concern remains about the additional encroachment into the countryside that would result from development on the larger site than that currently allocated.

It is considered that the proposed development of the larger site area remains unacceptable.

REJECT

YIELD -0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-64
Site name/address	South Lane, Sutton Valence
Landowner	Mrs Jeans
Agent	Sibley Pares
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	2
Proposed yield	Not stated
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Sutton Valence village boundary some 40m to the north of site.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site is a grass field (used to exercise horses) of a general rectangular shape and relatively flat and containing an 'oval-shaped gallop/exercise track.</p> <p>In general terms the site's boundaries consist of well established planting and there does appear to be significant trees and 'important' hedgerows within this planting.</p> <p>South Lane runs along the site's western boundary and there is a pavement on the opposite side of the road and street lighting. The speed limit here is 30mph.</p> <p>To the south there is residential development; to the east and west of the site the land is largely in agricultural/equestrian use; and Sutton Valence village boundary is to the north of the site as does one of the two doctors' surgeries in the village.</p>
Current use	Open field/Equestrian use.
Adjacent uses	As above.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside Greensand Ridge SLA
Planning history	Equestrian exercise track allowed in 2000.  1960's and 70's applications for residential development have been refused.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	'Land at South Lane' was considered by the Inspector and whilst unclear of the exact site, the Inspector did conclude to –  <i>"Not modify the Plan in response to this objection".</i>
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 42: Ulcombe Mixed Farmlands</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undulating landscape with wide views</li> <li>• Scattered orchards and mixed woodland blocks</li> <li>• Isolated oak trees within pasture and mature oak hedgerow trees</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited arable land</li> <li>• Field ponds</li> <li>• Linear settlements and strong local vernacular</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Very Good Sensitivity Assessment: Very High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the extensive tree cover provided by frequent woodland blocks, orchards and oak trees</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land use and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve the parkland at East Sutton Park</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale, mosaic like field pattern</li> <li>• Avoid further field segregation using post and wire fencing and encourage the reinstatement of native hedgerow boundaries where these have been removed</li> <li>• Conserve the distinctive amount of oak trees within the landscape, and plant new isolated specimens and hedgerow standards to replace ageing specimens</li> <li>• Conserve the distinctive linear pattern of settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the rural setting of traditional buildings and settlements</li> <li>• Soften the visual impact of large scale agricultural buildings with native planting</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p><u>KCC Biodiversity Officer advice -</u></p> <p><i>"We advise that most of the allocation sites will require preliminary ecological appraisal and some will require specific protected species surveys to ensure that all relevant material considerations can be addressed in the determination of applications. Ecological assessments will also support the developers in achieving BREEAM Code for Sustainable Homes targets and identify opportunities for ecological enhancements that will support Maidstone BC in meeting the principles of the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>A grassland field which may have small areas of scrub/rough grassland. The site is surrounded by mature trees/hedgerow. There is potential for protected/notable species to be present - in particular within the boundary of the site, there may be some potential for roosting bats to be present within the trees."</i></p> <p><b>Constraints Level 3 -</b> Potential for minor ecological impacts.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p><u>Landscape comments-</u></p> <p><i>"Whilst there are no TPOs covering the site there</i></p>

	<i>appear to be significant trees on the boundaries. There are no designated Ancient Woodlands. There may be 'important' hedgerows on site boundaries."</i>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 3
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<u>Conservation Officer comments;</u>  <i>Historic Buildings: None affected.</i>  <i>Conservation Areas: The Sutton Valence Conservation Area lies some distance to the north of this site, separated from it by an area of 20<sup>th</sup> Century development. Development of this site is unlikely to have any adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area.</i>  <i>Historic Parks and Gardens: None affected.</i>  <i>Archaeology: No known implications.</i>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Level 4 - Nothing known.
PROW (within or near site)	Public footpath KH504 runs parallel with the southern boundary of the site.
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties in Sutton Valence.</li> <li>• Site accessed from South Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the A274 Headcorn Road via South Lane, which has a good crash record, although there is a relatively poor crash record at the A274/South Lane junction, with one fatality recorded within the past five years. A continuous footway link (on opposite side of road) to Sutton Valence village centre and the bus stops on Headcorn Road is provided.</li> <li>• Many of the village services within Sutton Valence are within walking and cycling distance of the site and the bus stops on Headcorn Road are served by Bus Route 12, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone and Tenterden on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	54m from medical/GP service 5033m from secondary school 469m from primary school 365m from post office 388m from outdoor sports facilities 188m from children's play space 67m from publicly accessible green space 188m from bus stop Site is 5,086m from train station 651m from cycle route
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Mindful of dwellings to north and south.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Close to other residential properties and roads, so it is likely that connection to utilities would be possible.
Air quality/noise	No significant issues.
Land contamination	Not in or within 250m of landfill site.

Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not within or adjacent to Flood Zones 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	The site has a willing landowner Interested developer (Millwood)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent other than the removal of the existing exercise track.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	
2016 - 2021	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'The landowner has given no indication in terms of the number of dwellings the site could accommodate. If the site were to be considered for residential development, taking into account its edge of village location, a low density development would be appropriate, with a potential yield of around 60 dwellings.</i></p> <p><i>However, notwithstanding the potential site capacity, it is not considered that this is an appropriate use for this site due to its location. Indeed, whilst there may be no overriding consultee objections to delivering a residential scheme on this site, the redevelopment of the site would transform the existing character of the area; and there would be significant encroachment into the countryside that would harm the landscape and go against the pattern and grain of development in the surrounding area hereabouts.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to this, the site is located on greenfield land; and the site is not in easy access of a train station, local service centre, employment site or secondary school. It is therefore considered that the site should be rejected.'</i></p> <p>It is considered that there have been no significant changes in the material circumstances of the site since the previous assessment to warrant a different conclusion being reached. The key being that development would harm and erode the openness between the two sections of Sutton Valence village.</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0</p>



## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-67
Site name/address	(Part of) land west of Burial Ground Lane Tovil
Landowner	Fernham Homes
Agent	Phil Aelen DHA Planning
Greenfield/PDL	PDL
Site area (ha)	1.73
Proposed yield	55
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Urban
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site lies within the urban area of Maidstone on the western edge of Tovil. The site is bounded to the south by Dean Street, to the east by Burial Ground Lane, to the north by residential use and to the west by fields over which a PRoW crosses over in a north westerly direction.</p> <p>The site is previously developed land and the planning history reflects this.</p>
Current use	Industrial use
Adjacent uses	The surrounding area is a mix of residential and industrial with the recycling centre.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	The site is designated as an employment site in the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 under Policy ED2 as a site suitable for B1 and B2 uses.
Planning history	<p>MA/12/0980 – The development of 27 houses together with raising of land levels, new access and access road, parking, car barns and associated landscaping and footpath links – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p>MA/11/2168 – Land West of Burial Ground Lane. Erection of 29 dwellings including the raising of land levels within the site. WITHDRAWN</p> <p>MA/04/2413 – Land at, Burial Ground Lane. O/A for the erection of dwellings. REFUSED 9/3/05 (different site area)</p> <p>MA/03/2122 – Land to the west of Burial Ground Lane. Change of use of former waste disposal site to open storage for a temporary period. APPROVED 27/2/2004</p> <p>MA/92/1245 – Land on west side of Burial Ground Lane. Layout of new roads to serve existing and proposed development, provision of parking. APPROVED 11/06/93</p> <p>MA/86/0269 – Land at junction of Dean Street and Tovil Green. Erection of warehouse/workshop and</p>

	provision of portable office. APPROVED 01/04/1986
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	This objection is made on the basis that housing should be allowed on the site if its present commercial use should become redundant or surplus to requirements. This seems to me to be a matter wholly for development control not a planning policy, when matters such as the suitability of the site for housing, the need for commercial land, the benefits of development on brownfield sites and the effects on amenity can be taken into account along with the provisions of the Development Plan. In any case, given the present uses which I saw on my visit, even if housing is acceptable against these other considerations, I am not convinced that the site could be said to be genuinely available as required in PPG3.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	There are views of the site from Burial Ground Lane to the east and from the footpath to the west.  These views are generally short range views and the existing site is developed with industrial buildings which already have a significant visual impact on the character of the area.
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	The south of the site is an area of rough grassland/bare ground with hedgerows along the western and southern boundaries and we have previously commented on this area as part of a planning application. The north of the site is mostly hard standing with buildings and it has dense hedgerows along the North, Western and eastern boundaries. Site is adjacent to an area of ancient woodland. Greatest potential for protected/notable species to be present within the south of the site and the hedgerows and buildings. Species include roosting bats, reptiles and breeding birds.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	No protected trees on site some trees of importance around the boundaries.
Agricultural land quality	N/A
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	None
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Site could have some potential for early prehistoric remains but considerable disturbance from 20th century industrial activity.
PROW (within or near site)	None
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	The level of traffic generated is not significantly high when compared against that generated by an employment use of the site and this can be satisfactorily accommodated on the existing highway network. Adequate parking is provided and tracking diagrams have been submitted which indicate that the layout offers adequate space for deliveries, emergency services and refuse collection vehicles to turn.  Improvements are to be made to the accessibility and safety of the site by the provision of the

	<p>following off site highway works:-</p> <p>Improvements to the two existing bus stops at the junction of Burial Ground Lane with the B2010 by the provision of bus stop signs, bus boarders, shelters and hard standing areas.</p> <p>Best endeavours made to extend the existing 30mph speed limit for which a Traffic Regulation Order is required and this should be processed by the applicant. This should include works to remove the existing speed limit signs and surfacing and the provision of a new 'Gateway' feature at the new location.</p> <p>The construction of a footway between Burial Ground Lane and Tesco along the northern side of Farleigh Hill with dropped kerb crossing on Burial Ground Lane to connect with the new footways leading into the development site.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>The site is within the urban area of Tovil and close to its facilities.</p> <p>There is a bus service that runs into Maidstone and the centre is within walking distance.</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	There are nearby residential properties. However, development of the site is unlikely to have a significant impact.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	The surrounding area is residential and utilities would be connected to the existing uses.
Air quality/noise	The site is within the town centre air quality management area. There would be noise impacts from the nearby Tovil recycling centre.
Land contamination	Some possible contamination from the existing industrial uses.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Flood Zone 1
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>The site is previously developed land within the urban area of Maidstone and as such is generally acceptable for residential development.</p> <p>However, this site is allocated as an employment site under policy ED2 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000). If the rationalisation of employment sites means that this site is no longer pursued for employment purposes then a residential allocation may be appropriate.</p> <p>Approximate Yield: 55</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing developer
Availability conclusion	It is unclear from the submission whether there are any leases yet to expire.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Demolition and clear up but nothing would appear abnormal.
Achievability conclusion	There would appear to be no barrier to achievability.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous submission concluded as follows:-</p> <p><i>'The site is previously developed land within the urban area of Maidstone and as such is generally acceptable for residential development.</i></p> <p><i>However, this site is allocated as an employment site under policy ED2 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000). If the rationalisation of employment sites means that this site is no longer pursued for employment purposes then a residential allocation may be appropriate in the future. At this time however the site will be rejected for housing.'</i></p> <p>Recent work commissioned by the Council and undertaken by GVA into qualitative employment needs in the Borough has indicated that there is a need to retain this site and those adjacent as employment sites.</p> <p>Given this conclusion, the same conclusion should be reached</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD: 0</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-74
Site name/address	Fant Farm
Landowner	Not known
Agent	Phil Aelen – DHA Planning
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	47.6 (9.2ha residential). However 46.5ha indicated on submitted proforma.
Proposed yield	270 Dwellings with 38.4ha of Country Park
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to the urban boundary
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites (Re-submission)

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site is located to the south of the urban boundary and lies within the Medway Valley on the northern side of the river.</p> <p>The site has a sloping topography with the land sloping southwards towards the River Medway. The land is bordered by Gatland Lane to the north and an existing residential area, to the west by Farleigh Lane and to the south by the River Medway, Medway Valley Rail line and the Medway walk.</p> <p>Due to the valley-side location of the site, there are views across the Medway valley from the south with the proposed site clearly visible from the East Farleigh area, in particular Forge Lane. It is noted that 40ha of the site would be used to create a country park style area of open space, which would ensure protection for part of this landscape.</p> <p>The site includes much of the agricultural land in this area but extends around the existing farm buildings of Fant Farm. This includes a number of Grade II listed buildings sited in a cluster to the eastern side of the site.</p>
Current use	Orchards and agricultural fields
Adjacent uses	Residential (urban area)
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Site is located within an Area of Local Landscape Importance
Planning history	<p>There is Planning history at this site for a variety of proposals including the erection of dwellings. Application numbers listed below:-</p> <p>69/0700/MK1 – Refused 74/0708 – Refused 81/0715 - Refused</p>
Has site previously been considered	Considered within the SHLAA 2009

<p>in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation</p>	<p>Considered at the MBWLP Inquiry in 1998 Inspector's recommendations below:-</p> <p>(Conclusions</p> <p>4.518 Dealing with issue (a), I found on my visits to the area that these sites share the open, rural character and appearance of the large area of orchards lying to the south and east which extend along the side of the Medway Valley. Their openness ensures that this section of Gatland Lane has a rural character, despite some housing on its northern side. Moreover, they are clearly seen from Lower Road on the opposite side of the valley as part of Maidstone's countryside setting. Their rural character can also be appreciated from the public footpaths which run through the area covered by DH0293, and from Farleigh Lane. For all these reasons I do not agree with the objectors that the sites are not a major component of the central character of the ALLI, or that the adjoining urban area dominates their landscape character. I therefore do not accept objections DENV0423, DENV0508 and DENV0510 which I have recorded in Chapter 3 that the area should be excluded from the ALLI.</p> <p>4.519 In this context, I have no doubt that housing would be an intrusive urban feature into the town's countryside setting when seen from nearby and from Lower Road. I note the landscaping which is proposed in DH0293, but I do not consider that it would overcome the impact of new housing, and for this reason I do not agree that it would enhance any of the views of the site that I have described. Nor do I consider that the development of the smaller site covered by the other objections would significantly lessen the harmful impact of new housing. I therefore conclude that the proposals in these objections would materially harm the rural character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>4.520 Turning to issue (b), in paragraph 4.238 I found a need for an additional 940 units to meet Structure Plan housing requirements. Moreover, I accept in paragraph 4.700 that I have been unable to recommend enough sites to meet that need. However, in these cases I have no doubt that this does not outweigh the serious harm which I have found in issue (a). Although this housing need could override the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, such a loss reinforces my recommendation. In taking this view I have followed MAFF's approach and placed greater weight on the intrinsic quality of the land than on the problems of farming argued by the objectors. This seems to me to follow the advice in paragraph B7 of Annex B of PPG7 that land quality will normally be the most important factor.</p> <p>4.521 I therefore conclude that housing on these</p>
---	--

	<p>sites is not justified.  RECOMMENDATION  4.522 Do not modify the Plan in response to these objections).</p>
<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012  Landscape Character Area 24-2 : Fant Orchards</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tall hedges and shelterbelts</li> <li>• Fruit orchards, some derelict, with informal tracks</li> <li>• Some rough pasture adjacent to Maidstone’s urban edge</li> <li>• Traditional isolated properties and farmsteads</li> <li>• No highways, only a historic track accessing properties</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Poor  Sensitivity Assessment = Moderate  Guideline - Restore and Improve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands.</li> <li>• Respect the setting of Rectory Lane Orchards to the west and the Medway Valley to the south in any development proposals.</li> <li>• Maintain a buffer of open space and vegetation adjacent to the railway line to promote a robust landscape and ecological framework.</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site has some ecological value.</p> <p><b>KCC Ecology Response:-</b></p> <p>The majority of the site is intensive orchards or arable fields. There is an area of rough grassland/scrub to the south east of the site. Potential for protected/notable species to be present - including reptiles and breeding birds. (Level 4).</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p><b>Tree protection status</b>  There are no Tree Preservation Orders on this site.</p> <p><b>Ancient Woodlands</b>  There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p><b>Hedgerow status</b>  There appear to be no 'important' hedgerows.</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>The broad ALC Map indicates the site to be Grade 1 land – (However for information, it is stated within the submitted supporting statement that a survey of the land identified that the land comprises grades 2, 3a and 3b).</p> <p>Officer comment</p>

	<p>The ALC survey undertaken by MAFF in 1996 prior to the MBWLP 2000 inquiry indicates the site proposed for the housing to be comprised of Grade 2 (3.4ha), Grade 3a (3.4ha) and Grade 3b (2.2ha).</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> The site lies adjacent to Fant House and the collection of farmyard buildings at Fant Farm which were formerly associated with it. Fant House itself is Grade II listed, as is the former oast; a large barn is locally listed and other converted farm buildings add to the significance of the group and may be considered as non-designated heritage assets. The tall brick boundary wall to Fant House is also separately listed Grade II.</p> <p>Until the 1880s, Fant Farm occupied an entirely rural position. Since the 1880s, urban development has encroached upon it from the north-east and north-west, whilst land to the south-east and south-west has remained rural in character. The maintenance of this remaining rural setting is important to the significance of this group of buildings. The land now proposed for development wraps around the north-western and south-western sides of the Fant Farm group. The land to the north-west forms an open buffer between Fant House/ Farm and the urban development in Hackney Road and because Hackney Road rises away from the site it is looked down upon and is prominent in views of the group of historic buildings, to which it forms an important element of their setting, divorcing the historic group from the late 19<sup>th</sup>/ 20<sup>th</sup> Century development in Hackney Road. The land to the south-west, if developed, would extend the urban area into the open countryside which forms such an important part of the setting of the historic group. I therefore consider that the development of this site would be highly detrimental to the setting of the group of historic buildings at Fant Farm.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Archaeology:</b> No known implications.</p>
<p>Archaeology (SAM etc.)</p>	<p><b>KCC Archaeology Response:-</b></p> <p>Site may contain some Romano-British remains including burial remains; site lies adjacent to the post medieval farm and house complex of Fant Farm and grounds. (Level 3).</p>

PROW (within or near site)	There are a number of Public Rights of Way running through the site including KB17, KB11, KB12 and KB13.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p><b>KCC Highways Response:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessed from Hackney Road / Upper Fant Road via an unadopted, single carriageway access track.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing development at present, in view of the sub-standard nature of the Hackney Road / Upper Fant Road / site access junction and the requirement for development-related trips to route through an existing residential area to access the strategic road network.</li> <li>• The site enjoys good access to the A26 Tonbridge Road via Hackney Road and Fant Lane, which have a relatively good crash record, although there is a relatively poor crash record at the A26 / Fant Lane junction which may require mitigation. There are continuous footway links between the site access and Maidstone Town Centre.</li> <li>• The site is within and cycling distance of Maidstone Town Centre and the nearby bus stops on Upper Fant Road are served by Bus Route 8, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone Town Centre on weekdays.</li> <li>• It is recommended that Network Rail be consulted on this site given the proximity of the Medway Valley Line.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a bus route which runs along Gatland Lane providing a service between Maidstone Hospital and the Town Centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Farleigh Railway Station 1.1km</li> <li>• Barming Railway Station 2.9km</li> <li>• Maidstone East Railway Station 4km</li> <li>• Maidstone West Railway Station (HS1 trains) 2.6km</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 1.1km from local shops (Queens Rd/Tonbridge Rd junction)</li> <li>• 1.1km from 2 GP surgeries (Marigold Way and St Andrew’s Road)</li> <li>• Westborough Primary School 1.3km</li> <li>• Barming Primary School 1.5km</li> <li>• East Farleigh Primary School 2km</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	There would be limited impact upon existing residential amenity of properties within vicinity depending on residential layout, may be a loss of privacy/overlooking to rear of properties within Burns Road, Pitt Road and Cowdrey Close.
Availability of utilities infrastructure –	There is provision within the site for South East and

e.g. water/gas/electric	<p>Southern Water.</p> <p>Other utilities exist nearby within residential areas and can be provided within the proposed site.</p>
Air quality/noise	Adjacent to AQMA, but no issues raised.
Land contamination	Identified within possible contamination area. Further comments required.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	The southern end of the site is within a flood zone 2. However, the remainder of the site is outside of this zone and due to its sloping topography, is unlikely to be affected by flooding.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Good access to highway network and surrounding services.</li> <li>• Good level of housing yield.</li> <li>• Some landscape enhancement proposed.</li> <li>• Development would extend in similar pattern of development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive visual harm to Area of Local Landscape Importance.</li> <li>• Extensive views of the site possible from East Farleigh/ Medway Valley Area.</li> <li>• Land provides some landscape and ecology quality.</li> <li>• Harm to existing semi rural character of area.</li> <li>• Buffer to built development of urban area.</li> <li>• Significantly contributes to the character of the area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Whilst the site is visually prominent due to its location within the Medway Valley and there is likely to be some visual harm as a result, the site is considered to be in a sustainable location and relate well to the existing urban area such that it would represent a logical westward expansion of the urban area. In addition to this, the need to provide sites suitable for housing holds significant weight which outweighs this visual harm. In addition to this, the NPPF attaches less weight to the protection of locally designated landscapes such as the areas of local landscape importance which is applicable in this case. It is noted that 37.4ha of the site would be used to create a country park style area of open space, which would ensure long-term protection for part of this landscape.</p> <p>The site is therefore considered suitable for development.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Whole sites is available and there is a developer (Gleeson Homes)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	The site is currently in use for agricultural purposes. Whilst the land has a sloping topography, this is unlikely to form a significant constraint in the development of the site. No contamination issues.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	<b>X</b> (agent/developer suggested).
2016 – 2021	<b>X</b> (appropriate access arrangements would need to be agreed).
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'Given the urban periphery location of the site, a suitable density of 35dph would be appropriate. However, an element of the developable area of the site is likely to be lost in order to provide a buffer to the open space area retained to the south of the site and also to the cluster of nearby farm buildings, some of which are Grade II listed.</i></p> <p><i>The site is likely to link to Gatland Lane to provide access which KCC Highways consider to be appropriate, however some mitigation of congestion within the local area would be required which would need further consideration.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I consider that this site is suitable and I recommend that it is accepted for development.'</i></p> <p>The site was recommended for inclusion in the Reg18 draft of the Local Plan but was removed by the Cabinet primarily due to the ALC maps indicating that it was Grade 1 Agricultural Land. The impact of the site's development on the character of the Medway Valley was also discussed.</p> <p>It is clear that the area of the site potentially to be developed for housing comprises a mixture of Grade 2, 3A and 3B land and not Grade 1.</p> <p>Any application would also need to clearly address the issue of views across the Medway Valley and the extension of built development further down the Medway Valley side. The proposed country park could secure the long-term future of the remainder of the site.</p> <p>The proposers have reduced the proposed number of dwellings following further site assessment from the previously indicated 335 to 270.</p> <p>In order to provide a suitable form of development respecting its location and context,</p>

between 220 and 225 dwelling units would be more appropriate.

The site is considered to be suitable for development.

ACCEPT

YIELD-225

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-89
Site name/address	Millfield Reclamation Yard Holm Mill Lane Harrietsham
Landowner	Mr R Smith
Agent	
Greenfield/PDL	PDL
Site area (ha)	0.82
Proposed yield	Not specified
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>This is a rectangular shaped site, which lies approximately 800 metres to the west of Harrietsham village, in the open countryside.</p> <p>The site comprises a parcel of land to the east of Greenway Lane and north of Holm Mill Lane. The site itself is relatively flat, with a man-made bank built on the northern boundary. The site is currently in use as a reclamation yard.</p> <p>The site is connected to Harrietsham village by the A20 Ashford Road, and is surrounded by residential dwellings, a residential caravan park, horse paddocks and light industrial buildings. The caravan park is accessed from Greenway Lane and there are several other residential dwellings along Holm Mill Lane within reasonable proximity of the site.</p> <p>The site is screened from view from Greenway Lane on its western boundary and from the rear gardens of the residential dwellings along Holm Mill Lane to the south. There is limited screening along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site, which offer views of open countryside to the north and the neighbouring light industrial buildings to the east.</p> <p>The railway line is approximately 300 metres to the north of the site, and the A20 Ashford Road approximately 200 metres to the south.</p>
Current use	Site is in use as a reclamation yard.
Adjacent uses	There are residential dwellings to the south and west of the site, a caravan park to the north west, horse paddocks to the north and light industrial buildings to the east of the site.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	<p>None.</p> <p>The Kent Downs AONB Unit made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlooked from AONB</li> <li>• Orientation and layout important</li> </ul>

Planning history	<p>97/0613 – an application for a certificate of lawful development for the use of the site for the storage and distribution of building materials, wholesale and retail sale of building materials, and ancillary office and toilet block was approved.</p> <p>82/0611 – an outline application for the erection of a bungalow was refused.</p> <p>79/0256 – an application for the use of land to continue for winter storage of 20 caravans was approved.</p>
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>The site is currently well screened.</p> <p>The site is located within the Leeds Castle Parklands area of the Landscape Character Assessment 2012. Key characteristics of this area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artificial landform as part of golf course at Leeds Castle</li> <li>• Historic Leeds Castle and surrounding parkland</li> <li>• Pocket of lowland dry acid grassland</li> <li>• Mature parkland trees including oak, horse chestnut and pine</li> <li>• River Len to the south</li> <li>• Severance caused by the M20, HS1 and A20</li> </ul> <p>The condition assessment is <i>Moderate</i> and the sensitivity assessment <i>High</i>.</p> <p>The Guidelines for this area are to conserve and restore.</p>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>KCC Ecology states that the site consists of bare ground and rough grassland. To the west of the site there is a strip of woodland along the boundary. Has potential to be suitable for protected species including reptiles, GCN, bats and breeding birds.</p> <p>Constraint level 2 – potential for moderate ecological impacts.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	None.
Agricultural land quality	Site can be characterised as Grade 2 agricultural land.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<b>Historic Buildings:</b> The site lies near the Grade II Listed Holm Mill House. It does not contribute significantly to the setting of this listed building and in its current commercial use has some detrimental impact on its surroundings. Development of the site for housing purposes is unlikely to result in significant impact on the setting of the listed building.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>KCC Archaeology states that the site is adjacent to the historic farm complex of Holm Mill.</p> <p>Scale 4 – Low level archaeology anticipated which</p>

	could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.
PROW (within or near site)	None.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties on Holm Mill Lane.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Holm Mill Lane / Greenway Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a very limited quantum of housing only due to the restricted nature of Holm Mill Lane. It enjoys good access to the A20 Ashford Road via Holm Mill Lane, which has a good crash record, although there is no footway, forward visibility is poor in places and the carriageway is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass without encroaching on to the highway verge.</li> <li>• Many of the village services within Harrietsham, including the railway station, which is served by hourly train services to Ashford, Bearsted, Maidstone, Bromley South and London Victoria, are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site. The nearby bus stops on Ashford Road are served by Bus Route 10, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone, Bearsted, Lenham and Ashford on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	The village 'centre' including the local shop, pub, restaurant, bus stops and train station is just over 1km from the site. The village hall and medical centre are further from the site, approximately 2km away.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Limited impacts. The site is, however, in close proximity to a Grade II listed building.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Near to road and houses so potential for services. Landowner stated that water and electricity in place.
Air quality/noise	Railway noise (line is 300m to the north). The M20 and HS1 are located some 140-150m to the south Not in an AQMA
Land contamination	Likely to be contamination.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	The site does not lie within Flood Zone 2 or 3  The site is located in source protection zones 2 and 3.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	This is a brownfield site located in the open countryside and overlooked by the Kent Downs AONB. There are some large residential dwellings in the vicinity of the site which sit in large plots, one of which is listed. Whilst the village of Harrietsham and its services are 1km away, the site does not relate well to the village.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Whole site is available Developer interest in 2013 call for sites
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Development would depend on the sale of the existing site/business.
Achievability conclusion	Site could be achievable if existing business can be sold.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	
2016 - 2021	X
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows:</p> <p><i>'This brownfield site does not connect well to Harrietsham village. In addition, development of the site would be detrimental to the setting of the Kent Downs AONB and would have a negative effect on the setting of the listed building nearby. The availability and achievability of this site depend on the sale of the existing business.'</i></p> <p>There has been no change in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment, and it is therefore considered that the site remains unsuitable for development.</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0.</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-92
Site name/address	North of Redic House, Warmlake Road, Sutton Valence
Landowner	Mrs Z Wade
Agent	Lambert and Foster
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.15 (Combined residential development area with HO-94 = 0.55ha)
Proposed yield	16 (with adjacent site HO-94)
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites along with HO-94

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Appears to be former orchard – a few small trees remain – with well-maintained grass. Dwellings to south and east, field to west, commercial estate to north.
Current use	Former orchard/amenity land.
Adjacent uses	Residential, agricultural and commercial.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside only
Planning history	00/0715, 90/0639 & 90/0637 were all for one new dwelling (outline) REFUSED. 90/0637 was dismissed at appeal.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Residential development would involve “squaring off” of existing built development, as site is situated between existing residential and commercial development. Views are limited to those from the road and in these views development would be seen in the context of existing built development. Visual impact would, therefore, be relatively limited.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area Assessment: Landscape Character Area 29: Boughton Monchelsea to Chart Sutton Plateau KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plateau above the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Sweet chestnut coppice woodland</li> <li>• Orchards</li> <li>• Arable land</li> <li>• Recent infill development</li> <li>• Grid like road pattern</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment Very Poor Sensitivity Assessment Very Low Guidelines – Improve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for</li> </ul>

	<p>Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and improve the extent of woodland cover</li> <li>• Improve hedgerows and therefore habitat connectivity by gapping up where practicable</li> <li>• Improve the sense of place by maintaining remaining open space between swathes of development</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>KCC Ecological Officer comments:</p> <p>"A rough grassland field which is surrounded by mature hedgerows. Potential for reptiles to be present. Good Connectivity to the surrounding habitat. Ecological constraints level 3. Suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site. Near to designated site (including international, national, local and BAP habitat) with potential impact pathways. Likely level of significance is lower than (1) due to factors such as location (e.g. in relation to protected species ranges) and the extent of adjacent natural/semi-natural habitats."</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	None of significance.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	None
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>KCC Archaeological Advisor comments:</p> <p>"Adjacent to historic farm complex of Warmlake Farm. Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval."</p>
PROW (within or near site)	None affected
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Warmlake Road via a private, single carriageway residential lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the A274 Maidstone Road, although the nearby A274/Warmlake Road junction has a poor crash record which may require mitigation.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the village services within Sutton Valence are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site via the footway link on Maidstone Road and the nearby bus stops on Maidstone Road are served by Bus Route 12, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone, Headcorn and Tenterden on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>Extent of possible development limited, as sufficient distances to existing dwellings would be required to protect privacy. Proposed access off of Warmlake Road would cause noise and disturbance issues for adjoining properties and planning permission for residential development has previously been refused on this basis.</p>

	It is noted, however, that the land to the north has also been re-submitted (see reference HO-94 Warmlake Business Estate). If access was taken in from the north (via that site), noise and disturbance issues could be overcome.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Existing development adjacent to the site unlikely to be a problem in servicing the site
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Possible noise from industrial area adjacent to the site but this can be mitigated through appropriate design.
Land contamination	No significant issues
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Stated to be available.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Potential noise and disturbance issues from access if considered alone. Relatively limited wider visual impact and not close to facilities.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner Un-named developer interest
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Residential development would involve "squaring off" of existing built development, as the site is situated between existing residential and commercial development. Views are limited to those from the road and in these views development would be seen in the context of existing built development. Visual impact would, therefore, be relatively limited.</i>	
<i>However, proposed access off of Warmlake Road would cause noise and disturbance issues for adjoining properties due to the position of the access and planning permission for residential development has previously been refused on this basis.</i>	
<i>It is noted that the land to the north has also been submitted (see reference HO-94 Warmlake Business Estate). If access was taken in from the north (via that site), noise and</i>	

*disturbance issues could be overcome. However, it is not proposed to accept site HO-94 so this issue remains.*

*The site is not closely related to a good range of facilities and many trips are likely to be made by car.'*

Since the last assessment was undertaken, there have been no material changes in the circumstances of the site to warrant a different conclusion being reached. The site and that of HO-94 do not fit into the proposed settlement hierarchy.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-94
Site name/address	Warmlake Business Park, Maidstone Road, Sutton Valence
Landowner	Paice Pension Trust
Agent	Lambert & Foster
Greenfield/PDL	Previously developed land
Site area (ha)	Combined residential development area with HO-92 = 0.55ha
Proposed yield	16 dwellings combined with HO-92
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site is part of a commercial business park. It contains a large building of poor quality appearance and corrugated sheet roof, with substantial areas of hard-standing and some open storage.
Current use	Commercial uses
Adjacent uses	Surroundings are a mixture of residential and agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside only
Planning history	<p>Extensive relating to industrial use of premises. Most recent of relevance are:-</p> <p><u>98/1343</u> - Change of use of former agricultural building (The Granary, Unit 3) from wholesale warehouse to use within Class B1 - APPROVED</p> <p><u>98/0974</u> - Change of use of former agricultural building (The Granary, Unit 3) from wholesale warehouse falling within class X of the 1972 Use Classes Order to a use falling within class B1(A) and B1(C) ; plus the erection of a single storey extension - APPROVED</p> <p><u>97/1272</u> - Change of use and conversion of former agricultural buildings from wholesale warehouse or repositing (Class X of the 1972 Use Classes Order) to assembly, repair, maintenance, storage and distribution of lawn care and agricultural equipment or Class B1(b) or Class B1(c) (Unit 8); Class B1(a) or B1(b) (Unit 3); and Class B1 (b) or (c) (Units 9, 10, 11 and 12) - APPROVED</p> <p><u>96/0598</u> - Change of use and conversion of former agricultural buildings from wholesale warehouse or repository (Class X of the 1972 Use Classes Order) to assembly repair maintenance storage and distribution of lawn care and agricultural equipment (Unit 1) and Class B1 Business (Units 2 3 and 4) - APPROVED</p>

Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Although the building on site is of poor appearance, its visual impact upon the countryside is generally fairly neutral, as it is sited where it has limited visibility in public views, especially long range views, and it is grouped with other built development. Similarly, residential development is likely to have a generally neutral impact for the same reasons.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area Assessment: Landscape Character Area 29: Boughton Monchelsea to Chart Sutton Plateau</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plateau above the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Sweet chestnut coppice woodland</li> <li>• Orchards</li> <li>• Arable land</li> <li>• Recent infill development</li> <li>• Grid like road pattern</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Very Poor Sensitivity Assessment: Very Low Guidelines: Improve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Conserve and improve the extent of woodland cover</li> <li>• Improve hedgerows and therefore habitat connectivity by gapping up where practicable</li> <li>• Improve the sense of place by maintaining remaining open space between swathes of development</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>Not significant due to character of site/ extent of built/hard development.</p> <p>KCC Ecological Officer comments: "The majority of the site is hard standing, well managed amenity grassland and buildings. However to the South East of the site there is an area of rough grassland/scrub and the site is surrounded by dense hedgerows and there is good connectivity to the surrounding area. These areas have the highest potential for protected/notable species to be present for example bats/reptiles. Ecological constraints level 4. Some suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site."</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	None of significance
Agricultural land quality	Not relevant
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Existing building currently detracts somewhat from the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed oasthouse. Development could have a positive

	<p>impact upon this setting, subject to suitable design, etc.</p> <p>Conservation Officer comments;          "The site lies adjacent to a listed former oasthouse, now in commercial use. It is currently occupied by a modern business estate developed with large industrial-type sheds which adversely affect the setting of the listed building. Sympathetic housing development would potentially lead to an improvement in the setting of the listed building."</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	KCC Archaeological Advisor comments: "Part of historic farm complex of Warmlake Farm. Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval"
PROW (within or near site)	None affected
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Onto the A274. Bus stop nearby, although no crossing in between.</p> <p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties.</li> <li>• Site accessed from the A274 Maidstone Road via a private lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the A274 Maidstone Road, although the nearby A274/Warmlake Road junction has a poor crash record which may require mitigation.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Reasonably well related to facilities. School approximately 800m away and some facilities, eg doctors surgery, in Sutton Valence village, approximately 1,000m away. Sited upon bus route, cycling feasible.</p> <p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the village services within Sutton Valence are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site via the footway link on Maidstone Road and the nearby bus stops on Maidstone Road are served by Bus Route 12, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone, Headcorn and Tenterden on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	No significant issues expected.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Likely to be available given existing nearby development
Air quality/noise	Potential impact from adjacent retained commercial uses. Likely to be able to be designed-out. Not in an AQMA
Land contamination	Possible land contamination issues, due to current and previous issues.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p>Environment Agency comments:          The area between Cliff Hill and Beresford Hill of Boughton Monchelsea (NGR TQ773517) is at risk of flooding. The flooding mechanism of this area is complex and believed to be a combination of fluvial and groundwater flooding. Particular attention must therefore be given to means of surface water disposal from any new development</p>

	upstream from Boughton Monchelsea, especially if infiltration of surface water drainage is being considered. This is because the structure of the underlying geology could allow rapid infiltration from a developed area to discharge to the watercourse to the south more rapidly than the natural greenfield rate, thereby increasing flood risk to existing properties.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	No significant visual issues. Development would be to the rear of the retained commercial buildings.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner Interested (un-named) developer
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Potential contamination remediation costs. These are capable of being addressed though appropriate conditions.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	
2016 – 2021	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'Redevelopment would not cause significant visual harm to character or openness of countryside or harm to residential amenity.</i></p> <p><i>The site currently contains commercial buildings, which do not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the countryside, and their replacement with housing could have a positive impact upon the setting of the adjacent listed building.</i></p> <p><i>However, the site is not closely related to a good range of facilities and many trips are likely to be made by car.</i></p> <p><i>Also, this site is in active employment use. Redevelopment would result in a loss of employment space in a rural area, which may impact upon local employment and thereby also upon sustainability.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, considering the above, it is not recommended that this site be accepted. It is noted that there is the possibility of additional land adjoining this site – see HO-92 (Land to north of Redic House, Warmlake Road, Sutton Valence).'</i></p>

The main change in relation to the proposal since previously submitted, is the fact that this submission is now combined with the site for HO-92.

In addition, the commercial development on the Warmlake site is now shown retained with residential development at the western end of the site. This has reduced the anticipated level of development to 16 units.

Notwithstanding this, the site remains not well related to the settlements and necessary facilities and the same conclusions as previously have been reached in that the site is not recommended for development.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-99
Site name/address	Boughton Mount, Boughton Lane
Landowner	Kent County Council (KCC)
Agent	DHA Planning
Greenfield/PDL	PDL
Site area (ha)	4.6
Proposed yield	35-45
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites)	Re-submitted call for sites submission

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>Originally the location of a large country house, the site is the disused former KCC central nursery used for horticultural purposes. Special educational services were provided on site from the 1960s until around 4/5 years ago.</p> <p>The northern half of the site consists primarily of disused educational and horticultural buildings as well as hard standing used for associated car parking. There is a vacant dwelling also located on the site adjacent to Boughton Lane.</p> <p>There are two Grade II Listed designated heritage assets on the site, a Ha-Ha and a folly, both of which are located south of the complex of buildings in the site. Other notable buildings on the site comprise a substantial ragstone water tower and adjoining barn. There are also tall ragstone walls that used to surround a walled garden within the site.</p> <p>The cellars of the previously existing house were also retained when the current buildings were erected in the 1960s.</p> <p>The southern half of the site consists of the overgrown private gardens associated with the former residence.</p>
Current use	Disused.
Adjacent uses	Farm land to the north, east and west. Very low density residential to the south.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (MBWLP) 2000, ENV32 – southern anti-coalescence belt. Adjacent (to southern boundary), MBWLP 2000, ENV35 – Loose Valley Area of Local Landscape Importance.
Planning history	<p>Extensive history dating back to 1970s. Most recent shown.</p> <p>99/1216 – KCC internal – erection of new entrance building – raised no objections.</p> <p>00/0041 – KCC internal – works in association with new exit from site.</p>

	00/0709 – Change of use from agricultural to craft workshop, telesales, gallery and tea rooms – approved with conditions.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No Other sites in the near vicinity were considered and rejected on the basis that they would infill the openness between the A229 and A274 corridors.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Landscape Character Area 27:11 Boughton Farm <b>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orchards</li> <li>• Large intensive arable fields</li> <li>• Narrow hedge lined lanes</li> <li>• Large agricultural barns</li> <li>• Modern buildings with security railings</li> <li>• Traditional vernacular style buildings at Boughton Mount</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Poor Sensitivity Assessment: Moderate Guidelines: Improve and Restore</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Avoid developments which conflict with the rural, farmed landscape</li> <li>• Ensure the urban edge does not impinge on the small scale, isolated character of Boughton Quarries to the south</li> <li>• Reduce visual intrusion of development and associated lighting through native planting where practicable</li> <li>• Encourage sensitive boundary treatment and avoid urban sprawl</li> <li>• Encourage softening of security fencing through native planting</li> <li>• Restore hedgerow network and increase coverage of parkland trees</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	The site consists of rough grassland, trees/scrub and buildings. The site is surrounded by mature hedgerows. Potential for protected/notable species to be present throughout the whole site. Including bats (roosting and foraging), breeding birds, reptiles and dormice.  2/4, 1 is the most sensitive.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<b>Tree protection status:</b> Whilst there are currently no protected trees there are significant trees both on the site boundaries and in the south of the site which would constrain the development potential. A TPO assessment has been requested by the Parish Council. <b>Ancient woodlands</b> (from 'a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone Borough, August 2012') There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2.
Heritage impacts (Listed building,	There are a listed Ha-Ha and listed Folly (both

conservation area)	Grade II) within the site. Also substantial ragstone walls in what appears to be a good state of repair and a ragstone water tower and attached storage building.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Site comprises historic post medieval country house complex of Boughton Mount with associated landscaped historic gardens and specimen/veteran trees; lies within an area of Iron Age and Romano-British activity.  2/5, 1 is the most sensitive.
PROW (within or near site)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpath KM99 runs along the eastern boundary of the site.</li> <li>• Footpath KM55 running west from the south western boundary of the site.</li> </ul>
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	Comments as per site 112, Land at Boughton Lane (opposite Land at Boughton Mount to the west). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties within Loose.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Boughton Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of the severe peak period congestion at the A229 Loose Road / Boughton Lane / Cripple Street junction and the limited options for further capacity improvements.</li> <li>• Boughton Lane has a good crash record, although there is a relatively poor crash record at its junction with Loose Road which may require mitigation and the eastward extension of the 30mph speed limit beyond the site access may be required.</li> <li>• There is no footway between the site access and the New Line Learning Academy; however there is a footway link between Boughton Lane and Eddington Close which provides onward connectivity to the bus stops on Loose Road.</li> <li>• Many of the local services within Loose are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site and the bus stops on Loose Road are served by Bus Routes 5 and 89 which provide a combined 15-minute frequency to Maidstone Town Centre on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Primary school (Tiger School, Boughton Lane) – 660 metres. GP (Branch Surgery, junction of Boughton Lane, Cripple Street and Loose Road) – 1.3km. Shop (junction of Boughton Lane, Cripple Street and Loose Road ) – 1.3km. Bus stop (Loose Road) – 1.2km. Railway station (Maidstone East) – 4.4km.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	The primary impact would be associated with traffic using Boughton Lane to access the A229. The transport comments allude to the fact that the junction with Loose Road and Cripple Street has limited scope for further improvement. Traffic using this route is already substantial so development at

	this location would only add more.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	This site is already connected to local utilities.
Air quality/noise	No comments.
Land contamination	No comments. Some potential contamination arising from the former agricultural/horticultural uses on the site may be possible.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Zone 1.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site comprises a substantial area of previously developed land (buildings and hardstanding areas).</li> <li>• Utilities will already serve the site.</li> <li>• A degree of traffic caused by the development of this site will already be accounted for due to the existing/previous use.</li> <li>• Development would secure the retention of the designated and other non-designated heritage assets within the site and also the restoration of the former parkland associated with the house.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u> The site is relatively isolated. If improvements are required to Boughton Lane these could have a visual impact on its rural character.</p> <p><u>Conclusions</u> Overall, whilst this site has some sensitivity from an ecological and archaeological point of view, its fairly isolated and contained location would reduce to some degree the visual impact of development. Suitable planting could also be secured to provide some additional screening to character enhancement to the site. The necessary road improvements, to Boughton Lane, and potentially to Pested Bars Road, as commented by the inspector for the MBWLP 2000 could be achieved and secured through suitable S106 agreements.</p> <p>The site is therefore considered suitable for development.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Whole site available Willing landowner
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	<p>The site is likely to have substantial clearance and clean-up costs, but these are not likely to be so great as to constrain development.</p> <p>It is understood that there are restrictive covenants on the land imposed at the time of sale/gift to KCC by the site owner. Whilst not a planning consideration, they may act as a constraint if not resolved.</p>
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	
2016 - 2021	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded that the site should not be allocated due it not being in accord with the proposed spatial hierarchy. That is despite it being considered suitable for development.</p> <p>Whilst the site does not lie immediately adjacent to the existing urban area, it is considered to be reasonably well related to it.</p> <p>Visually, the site is well contained with dwellings to the north and east (as well as PROW KM99 to the east, which is a metalled driveway for much of its length) and Boughton Lane to the west and south. There is an established tree screen to all boundaries.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst the site overall amounts to approximately 4.6ha, approximately 1.8ha can be considered as previously developed land comprising the former KCC buildings and extensive areas of hardstanding/car park areas associated with these. The remainder comprises the former gardens/parkland associated with the previously existing house.</p> <p>As indicated above there are designated and non-designated heritage assets within the site. A re-development of this now redundant site would secure the retention and renovation of these assets and also the restoration of the former private gardens/parkland associated with the previous dwelling. The Council has a statutory duty to ensure the preservation/enhancement of these assets. This is a key consideration of considerable weight re-emphasised by recent appeal decisions elsewhere in the Borough.</p> <p>Given the visual containment of the site, the need to preserve/enhance the designated/non-designated heritage assets and the location of the site which is reasonably well located to the existing urban area, it is considered that an appropriate redevelopment of this site would be acceptable.</p> <p>Development should, however, be restricted to the currently developed area which, as stated above, is approximately 1.8ha. The water tower/barn and as many of the existing ragstone wall features including the remnants of the walled garden as possible should be retained. It is understood that the cellar areas of the previous house were retained when the site was redeveloped in the 1960s.</p> <p>It is considered that in the region of 25 units would provide a more appropriate form of development than that suggested by the agent. This is on the basis of the site's setting and constraints (trees, ecology and archaeology/heritage issues). Work will need to be undertaken to establish an appropriate level of development that secures the retention and</p>

restoration of the designated/non-designated heritage assets and provides an appropriate setting for them. Clearly the viability of any scheme will be a key consideration.

ACCEPT

YIELD - 25

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-102
Site name/address	Bletchingley Farm, Pristling Lane, Staplehurst
Landowner	Unknown
Agent	Wealden Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Mainly appears previously developed
Site area (ha)	1
Proposed yield	7 additional units
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites submission

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Former farmyard and farmhouse in relatively isolated rural location. Some traditional farm buildings, including oasthouse and some modern buildings in poor condition, including Dutch pole barn. Extensive areas of hard-standing and quite a few vehicles stored on site. Appears to be partly in use for motor vehicle businesses. Also includes residential Grade II Listed farmhouse and garden.
Current use	Lawful use not readily apparent from planning history. Appears to be in current use for vehicle restoration/maintenance and a residential dwelling (farmhouse).
Adjacent uses	Mainly agricultural land, some residential.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside and Special Landscape Area.
Planning history	<p><u>07/1638</u> - Detached outbuilding - APPROVED</p> <p><u>02/0296</u> - Detached outbuilding - AAPPROVED</p> <p><u>00/0497</u> - Demolition of redundant farm buildings and workshops, conversion of existing oast to 1No. dwellinghouse, conversion of existing barn to stabling and garaging and erection of 3No. dwellinghouses with garaging and access onto Pristling Lane - REFUSED, APPEAL DISMISSED</p> <p><u>99/0979</u> - Demolition of farm buildings and workshops and conversion of oast and barn to one dwelling, conversion of barns to 3x 1 bed holiday cottages and erection of 4x 2 storey houses - REFUSED</p> <p><u>98/0021</u> - Certificate of lawful development for existing use of units 18, 19, 20, 21 &amp; 22 for agricultural engineering, spares storage, general vehicle repairs, haulage operating centre, furniture construction and repair and general carpentry and boat repair - WITHDRAWN</p> <p><u>95/1126</u> - LBC for single storey extension to dwelling - APPROVED</p>

	85/0236 - Conversion of oasthouse and hopper huts to three dwelling units – APPROVED
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Former farm, generally in keeping with the rural character of the countryside. Some buildings are of poor visual appearance/ quality but they are in keeping with what one expects to see in such a rural location. These buildings and the open storage on site are of relatively limited visual impact in longer views, due to the height of some buildings, the alignment of the road, the layout of the site and some conifer screening. The extent of proposed development would cause harm to the openness of the countryside, although the impact would be somewhat lessened because there is already built development on site. Also, it would cause harm to the rural character and appearance of the Special Landscape Area and would be out of keeping with the generally sparse degree of existing residential development in the locality. The conversion of some existing better quality buildings to residential may have relatively limited visual impact, subject to detail.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area Assessment: Landscape Character Area 45 Sherenden Wooded Hills</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying and gently undulating clay Low Weald landscape with many ponds, ditches and watercourses</li> <li>• Large irregular blocks of ecologically important ancient woodland interspersed with pasture, orchards and arable fields</li> <li>• Species rich native hedgerow field boundaries with mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where boundaries have been removed</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered throughout the landscape</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Very Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guidelines - conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the setting of the High Weald AONB</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of ancient woodland blocks and enhance through sensitive management for nature conservation and woodland products</li> <li>• Conserve oak as a dominant hedgerow tree species, and plant new oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and enhance the species rich hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• Encourage the restoration of lost hedgerow boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land, hop gardens and orchards and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve the wealth of historic buildings</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	Potential for protected species (eg bats, newts) within traditional buildings.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	None of significance
Agricultural land quality	Grade 3
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>Listed building on site would need to be retained. Existing buildings, although some of poor quality, are not out of character with what one would expect to see close to such a farmhouse. It is not considered that there would be any enhancement to the setting of the Listed building.</p> <p>Conservation Officer comments:  "Bletchingley Farmhouse (Grade II) lies within the proposed site which also includes its former farmyard. Whilst the latter does contain some unattractive modern buildings, it also includes some traditional buildings, such as an oast, which are important contributors to the setting of the listed farmhouse and add to its significance. Development of the site for new build housing would result in the loss of these buildings and also a loss of the rural setting of the listed farmhouse. There would also be a similar adverse impact on the listed Chapmans Farm opposite. Conversion of selected traditional buildings within the farm complex is likely to be considered acceptable."</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	KCC Archaeological Advisor comments: "Part of historic farm complex of Bletchingley, with main building dating from 16 <sup>th</sup> century. Several farm buildings identifiable on 1 <sup>st</sup> Ed OS map may be surviving below ground. Significant archaeology could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval"
PROW (within or near site)	None affected
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Use of public transport not feasible. Single track road.</p> <p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessed from Pristling Lane, which is a single carriageway lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a very limited quantum of housing given its isolated location. Pristling Lane has a good crash record but is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass without encroaching on to the highway verge.</li> </ul>

Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	No services close to site. Farm shop approximately 0.9 miles away. Facilities in Staplehurst village more than 1 mile away. No pavements.  KCC Highways comments: • There are no services or public transport links within walking distance of the site and no formal footways are provided on Pristling Lane.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	No significant issues.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Likely due to motor related uses.
Air quality/noise	No Not in an AQMA
Land contamination	Given previous and current uses contamination is likely
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zone 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Unsuitable due to harmful visual impact, harm to setting of listed building and unsustainable location.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Un-named willing landowner Interested developer – Wealden Homes Some existing businesses may need to relocate
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	There is likely to be some cost in clearing the existing buildings and dealing with any contamination.  These are unlikely to be insurmountable however.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Likely to result in harm to the character and appearance of the Special Landscape Area, the setting of listed buildings and the site is in an unsustainable location.</i>	
<i>This is a former farm, generally of rural appearance. The extent of built development proposed (20-25 dwellings) would unacceptably erode the openness of the Special Landscape Area and harm its rural character. It would be out of keeping with the sparse extent of built development in the surroundings.</i>	

*The site is not closely related to facilities and is considered unsustainable. Access is insufficient, being onto a single track rural lane.*

*There would be an adverse impact upon the rural setting of Listed Bletchingley Farmhouse.*

*Conversion of selected traditional buildings to residential (which may be feasible) could be dealt with under a planning application if submitted.'*

Whilst the conversion of the existing traditional buildings on the site remains possible and the level of proposed development has reduced considerably since the previous submission, the site is still in an isolated rural and unsustainable location. As such it is not considered that even a reduced level of development is acceptable in principle.

REJECT

YIELD -0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-105
Site name/address	Moat Farm, Moat Road, Headcorn
Landowner	St John's College
Agent	Savills
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield - although contains redundant oast house/farm buildings in the south east corner.
Site area (ha)	6.7
Proposed yield	200 approx.
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to rural service centre.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local Plan rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site lies to the west of Headcorn, and to the north of Moat - which links Headcorn and Staplehurst. Within the south eastern corner of the site are a number of redundant farm buildings. These have direct access onto Moat Road.</p> <p>To the south-west of the site is an electricity substation.</p> <p>To the south of the site is open fields, which has a watercourse running through it. This watercourse runs under Moat Road to the south east of the application site.</p> <p>To the east of the site are residential properties, located both upon Mill Bank (the A274) and Bankfields, a more recent estate.</p> <p>To the north of the site are open fields, as there are to the west.</p> <p>Within the site the land rises as one moves northwards, with a ridge within the site. This change in levels is relatively significant. There are existing field margins within the application site that include trees and shrub planting.</p>
Current use	Redundant buildings and agricultural use.
Adjacent uses	Residential and agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Special Landscape Area. The southern part of the site falls within flood zone 2.
Planning history	<p>MA/00/1910 - Application for the renewal of permission MA/95/1699 to convert oast to B1 office use, demolition of existing buildings and refurbishment of former granary. Approved.</p> <p>MA/95/1699 - Renewal of MA/91/0230 to convert oast to B1 office use demolition of existing buildings and refurbishment of former granary. Approved.</p>

	MA/91/0230 - Conversion of oast to office use (class B1) demolition of existing buildings and refurbishment of former granary. Approved.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	N/A
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Site falls within the Landscape Character Area 43: Headcorn Pasturelands</p> <p>Key features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald.</li> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge.</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult.</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture.</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets.</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees.</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald.</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and hedgerows to replace ageing population.</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land use and resist conversion to arable land.</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure.</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads.</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along Maidstone Road.</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting.</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting a framework of vegetation in these areas.</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	The site contains farm buildings but the majority of the site is two grassland fields which are bounded by hedgerows. There is an area of rough grassland around the farm buildings which has potential for reptiles to be present. There is also the potential for bats to be roosting within the building.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	TPO 5 of 1986 – covers the trees within the centre of the site.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	N/A
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Site of ROC underground monitoring post; contains part of Moat Farm historic farmstead and Medieval Moat
PROW (within or near site)	KH590 runs through the site in a north-westerly

	direction.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>The site is currently accessed from Moat Road and is adjacent to existing residential development.</p> <p>Moat Road in the vicinity of the site is a national speed limit road. The speed limit would need to be reduced if the site were to be developed.</p> <p>Visibility splays from the existing access appear acceptable and the crash record for Moat Road in the vicinity of the site is good. However, the site is large and the impact of a significant increase in the number of cars using Moat Road into Headcorn and the junction between Moat Road and the A274 would need further assessment. Moat Road does not have footways into Headcorn and this would also need to be addressed.</p> <p>Services are available in Headcorn although they would be at least 1km from the furthest part of the site.</p> <p>The hourly service 12 provides a bus service to Maidstone on the A274 but there is no public transport that directly serves the site. The A274 is too far from the furthest extents of the site to provide acceptable access to public transport and therefore mitigation would be required, either in the form of a new bus service or a diversion of Route 12 to serve the site. A diversion would require the service to pass through the site and rejoin Maidstone Road north of the Moat Road/A274 junction.</p> <p>An access to the site from the A274 would be preferable and would address some of the issues outlined above.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Bus stop – 100m (approx)</p> <p>Rail station – 750m (approx)</p> <p>Shop – 100m (approx)</p> <p>GP – 500m (approx)</p> <p>School – 350m (approx)</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>The existing properties within Bankfields and Mill Bank would lose open views to the rear. Nonetheless, I am satisfied that through a suitable layout, the impact upon their amenity could be addressed. There is formal open space with a playground off Kings Road within a short walk of the site. Open fields to the north, west and south of the site.</p>
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	<p>Nearby to existing residential properties – likely to be existing/potential connections.</p>
Air quality/noise	<p>Not in an AQMA</p> <p>Noise unlikely to be a problem</p>
Land contamination	<p>Potentially around existing farm buildings</p>
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p>A small portion of the site in the SE corner and Moat Road itself lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p>
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>Given the existing form of the village, despite the</p>

	site being deliverable in principle, it is likely to cause an undue extension to the west into open countryside that would significantly change the form of the village.
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	<p>Potential archaeological interest Part of site subject to flooding, in addition, Moat Road is within Flood Zone 3 either side of the site which could result in access problems</p> <p>These issues could be resolved. Flood issue more problematical</p>
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable subject to resolution of the above issues

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	
2016 - 2021	X Proposer indicated this time period previously
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous submission concluded as follows	
<p><i>'Overall conclusions: Given the existing form of the village, despite the site being deliverable in principle, it is likely to cause an undue extension to the west into open countryside that would significantly change the form of the village. It is therefore recommended that the site be rejected.'</i></p>	
There have been no changes in the material circumstances of the site since the previous submission such that there is no reason for the conclusion to differ.	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-106
Site name/address	Rectory Fields, Frittenden Road
Landowner	St John's College (Cambridge)
Agent	Savills
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	4
Proposed yield	120
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local Plan rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Site slopes up to north, and is bounded and bisected by mature native hedges with mature trees which are likely to be of historic importance. The central east-west hedge runs along a ridge. The site contains a pond. The KM307 public footpath runs through the site and along part of the south west boundary (it appears very well used). Site currently in use for grazing of horses. Existing access from Frittenden Road. Located in close proximity to Staplehurst Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings; due to slope of land the site contributes to their setting. The site is bounded by agricultural land to the north and east by agricultural land, a thin buffer strip of agricultural land separates the site from the settlement boundary of Staplehurst and heritage assets. A dwelling abuts the southern boundary of the site.
Current use	Agricultural, rough grassland/pasture.
Adjacent uses	Agricultural, residential.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside, SLA, "ponds and pastures" Local Wildlife Site.
Planning history	64/0589/MK3 Outline application for church car park – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (believed not to have been implemented)
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Unknown.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Would be physically isolated from the village of Staplehurst, and very visually prominent due to position on land sloping down towards the Weald. Loss of trees and disruption to field boundaries would be detrimental to character and appearance of countryside and SLA.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of</li> </ul>

	<p>the Low Weald</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small fields with orchards, pastures, ponds and watercourses enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost</li> <li>• Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed for intensive arable cultivation</li> <li>• Sparse scattered small woodlands</li> <li>• Winding roads with wide verges</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• the pastoral land use and orchards, and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>This site is a LWS designated for unimproved neutral grassland with associated ponds and hedgerows. It consists of 3 fields with patches of rough grassland and is surrounded by mature hedgerows. There are 4 ponds in the site or within 100m of the site. Potential of protected/notable species being present including GCN and other</p>

	reptiles.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	Along boundaries and existing field boundaries within site; none protected or registered, but likely to be of historic interest and prominent in public views.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> The main impact would be on the Grade I Listed Parish Church whose churchyard currently looks out over open countryside to the east. This is an important feature of its setting and acts as a contrast to the close proximity of the church to village buildings in the opposite direction. Development of this site would destroy this rural setting and thus harm the significance of the church.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> The site lies adjacent to the Staplehurst Conservation Area. Staplehurst developed as a linear village along the old Roman road, and originally buildings on the street frontage opened directly onto open countryside behind. This relationship has been lost on the western side of the street because of 20<sup>th</sup> century housing developments but largely survives on the eastern side where it forms an important element of the conservation area's character. The loss of this relationship between the original village development and the rural hinterland which would ensue from development of this site would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Adjacent to site of Smock Mill (MBC CO: No known implications although the proximity of the medieval village and the Roman road mean that there might be potential.)
PROW (within or near site)	The KM307 public footpath runs through the site and along part of the south west boundary (it appears very well used).
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Frittenden Road is a classified highway, the C70, national speed limit.</p> <p>Site is adjacent to existing residential properties and accessed from Frittenden Road, which is a narrow lane with no footways. As the site is of significant size, modelling would need to be carried out to assess the impact the additional traffic flows will have on Frittenden Lane, and mitigation may be required. The crash record at the junction of Frittenden Lane and the A229 is concerning and signalisation is likely to be required for the development to be acceptable. The lack of footways on Frittenden Lane would need to be mitigated and this may be achieved by providing an alternative pedestrian access to the A229.</p> <p>The service 5 provides an hourly link to Maidstone and further access to public transport is provided at Staplehurst rail station, around 1 mile away from the site. Access to services is also provided in Staplehurst.</p> <p>Access to the strategic road network is through</p>

	Maidstone town centre, which is a cause of concern.
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Staplehurst village centre (approximately 0.6km). Bus service from High Street/Cranbrook Road (0.2km), railway station 1.7km.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Site abuts 1 adjacent residential property. Land appears to be in regular use by users of footpath; would result in loss of open space and harm to character of public footpath.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Reasonable, likely to be some services as there are other isolated properties in the vicinity, and in close proximity to settlement boundary of Staplehurst.
Air quality/noise	Not applicable.
Land contamination	Not applicable.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not applicable.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is located on a prominent slope on the southern approach to the RSC, and is visible for some distance in views from the south. Development of the site would cause harm to the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area. It is unlikely that these impacts could be mitigated by landscaping. Frittenden Lane is unsuitable for an access and mitigation, including the signalisation of the junction with the A229 and the introduction of pedestrian foot paths, may be required. Trees and hedges on the site are likely to represent constraints on development. There are ponds within the site, and ecological mitigation is likely to be necessary.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner; no identified developer.
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Trees and historic hedgerows; land levels are likely to result in the need for significant earthworks. Site also a designated Local Wildlife Site.
Achievability conclusion	A number of potentially limiting constraints

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	
2016 – 2021	X Proposer previously indicated this timescale
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	

*'The site is located on a prominent slope on the southern approach to the RSC, and is visible for some distance in views from the south. Development of the site would cause harm to the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area. It is unlikely that these impacts could be mitigated by landscaping Frittenden Lane is unsuitable for an access and mitigation including the signalisation of the junction with the A229 and the introduction of pedestrian foot paths may be required. Trees and hedges on the site as well as the land levels are likely to represent constraints on development. There are ponds within the site, and ecological mitigation is likely to be necessary.'*

There have been no material changes in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment to warrant a different conclusion being reached.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-112
Site name/address	Land at Boughton Lane
Landowner	Persimmon Homes South East
Agent	Pegasus Planning
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	9.8
Proposed yield	70-90 dwellings (on 2.7 ha)
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to urban area
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submission on call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>Site is comprised of three distinct portions in a backwards 'L' shape to the west of Boughton Lane. The urban boundary is adjacent to the site along its western boundaries with gaps in some locations. The northern portion of the site is an existing orchard, bounded by hedgerows. The middle portion of the site, opposite Boughton Mount, is an arable field, this is bounded by hedgerows and a line of trees on the southern side. The southern portion of the site is also an arable field, this is bounded by hedgerows in the east and west, a line of trees on the northern side and a footpath and fence on the southern side.</p> <p>The developer is proposing to develop the western half of the southern portion. The eastern boundary of the development would align with the existing garden line of the houses to the north.</p>
Current use	Agricultural.
Adjacent uses	<p>West – residential.            North – agricultural.            East – Agricultural/training establishment (disused).            South – low density residential.</p>
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	<p>Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (MBWLP) 2000 – ENV32 Southern anti-coalescence belt.            South of site – MBWLP 2000 – ENV35 Loose Valley Area of Local Landscape Importance.</p>
Planning history	None.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	<p>The inspector for the 2000 Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan examination considered this site, although the proposal that was considered was for housing on the northern portion of the site. The proposal was amended late in the examination to reflect the current proposal of residential development at the south of the site, with the remainder of the site given over to uses more compatible with the rural character of the area e.g. orchards.</p> <p>The inspector did not consider that this site was appropriate, even in its current form, because of its</p>

	<p>impact on the countryside character of the area. There was also concern at the time that the access proposals were not convincing. The inspector did not consider this site necessary to meet structure plan housing targets.</p> <p>Area proposed for housing (south west corner) was submitted as sites 168 and 174 to the 2009 strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) call for sites.</p>
<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p>Landscape Character Area 27:11 Boughton Farm KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orchards</li> <li>• Large intensive arable fields</li> <li>• Narrow hedge lined lanes</li> <li>• Large agricultural barns</li> <li>• Modern buildings with security railings</li> <li>• Traditional vernacular style buildings at Boughton Mount</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Poor Sensitivity Assessment: Moderate Guidelines: Improve and Restore</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Avoid developments which conflict with the rural, farmed landscape</li> <li>• Ensure the urban edge does not impinge on the small scale, isolated character of Boughton Quarries to the south</li> <li>• Reduce visual intrusion of development and associated lighting through native planting where practicable</li> <li>• Encourage sensitive boundary treatment and avoid urban sprawl</li> <li>• Encourage softening of security fencing through native planting</li> <li>• Restore hedgerow network and increase coverage of parkland trees</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>Intensively managed orchard to the north of the site and there are two grassland fields in the south of the site. All the fields are surrounded by hedgerows/mature trees. Generally the site has limited potential - some limited potential for protected/notable species within the boundaries (including roosting bats).</p> <p>3/4, 4 is least sensitive.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p>Adjacent to site: Number 14 of 2009. Number 18 of 2009.</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>Grade 2.</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> Slade House in Pickering Street lies immediately adjacent to the site; indeed, its gardens extend into the proposed site. The drawings submitted by</p>

	<p>Pegasus Urban Design, however, show no development on this part of the site; if this is to be the case, potential impact may be acceptable, although I would prefer it if the development site excluded the land within the curtilage of Slade House.</p> <p>The ha-ha and folly at Boughton Mount which lies directly opposite the site on the other side of Boughton Lane have just been spot-listed, Grade II; however, development in the manner suggested on Pegasus Urban Design's drawing would have little impact on the setting of these features.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> The boundary of the Loose Valley Conservation Area lies close to this site to the south. However, tree screening and topography mean that development of this site would have no significant impact on its setting.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> There are no registered sites affected. The grounds of Boughton Mount are of local interest but development in the manner suggested on Pegasus Urban Design's drawing would have little impact on their setting.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>Site contains Bronze Age and Iron Age activity and settlement remains; lies c.400m north of Scheduled Monument Boughton Monchelsea Iron Age oppidum; site lies adjacent to historic post medieval country house complex of Boughton Mount.</p> <p>3/5, 5 is the least sensitive.</p>
PROW (within or near site)	<p>KM55 runs along the southern boundary of the site. KM101 runs from the middle of the southern boundary in a south eastern direction away from the site.</p>
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties within Loose.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Boughton Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of the severe peak period congestion at the A229 Loose Road / Boughton Lane / Cripple Street junction and the limited options for further capacity improvements.</li> <li>• Boughton Lane has a good crash record, although there is a relatively poor crash record at its junction with Loose Road which may require mitigation and the eastward extension of the 30mph speed limit beyond the site access may be required.</li> <li>• There is no footway between the site access and the New Line Learning Academy; however there is a footway link between Boughton Lane and Eddington Close which provides onward connectivity to the bus stops on Loose Road.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of the local services within Loose are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site and the bus stops on Loose Road are served by Bus Routes 5 and 89 which provide a combined 15-minute frequency to Maidstone Town Centre on weekdays.</li> </ul>
<p>Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school</p>	<p>Bus stop (A229 Loose Road) – 520m  Railway station (Maidstone East) – 4.6km.  Primary school (Loose) – 520m (Tiger Primary School) – 500m  GP (Branch Surgery, Parade at Boughton Lane, Cripple Street, Loose Road junction) – 1.5km.  Shops (Parade at Boughton Lane, Cripple Street, Loose Road junction) – 1.5km.</p>
<p>Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)</p>	<p>The primary impact would be associated with traffic using Boughton Lane to access the A229. The transport comments allude to the fact that the junction with Loose Road and Cripple Street has limited scope for further improvement. Traffic using this route is already substantial so development at this location would only add more.</p> <p>The proposal to develop the south western portion of this site would mean that the remainder of the site, currently in agricultural use, would be given over to formal open space.</p>
<p>Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric</p>	<p>Taken from Strategic Sites Assessment 2009.</p> <p>South East Water has confirmed that there is enough capacity to supply water to this location, however off site reinforcement will be required at the cost to the developer. Sites within the main urban areas generally incur fewer costs than that of more rural locations.</p> <p>National Grid have confirmed that the anticipated additional growth at Maidstone Borough will not create capacity issues particularly given the scale of the electricity and gas transmission networks. Detailed assessments of each site will be required to determine site specific issues.</p> <p>Southern Water has confirmed that in terms of sewage there is no fundamental reason why this site would not be suitable for development. However, it is likely that improved infrastructure will be required to serve the site. Detailed assessments will be required at the planning application stage however if capacity is insufficient the developer will need to requisition a connection to the sewage system.</p> <p>Southern Water have confirmed that surface water should not be discharged to the foul sewer but to a separate system e.g. soakaways, SUDS or local water course. Southern Water will not adopt these systems and if a discharge is proposed to an existing surface water sewer owned by Southern Water, a capacity test will be required</p>

Air quality/noise	Adjacent to air quality management area.
Land contamination	No comments.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Zone 1.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development is a small portion of wider site.</li> <li>Proposed development is adjacent to the urban boundary.</li> <li>Remainder of site would be kept for uses more in keeping with countryside character.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to the site would possibly mean that Boughton Lane would need works to make it acceptable. No specific works have been specified by Kent Highways however.</li> <li>Cumulative traffic impact with other proposed and already approved development in Boughton Lane at the New Line Learning Academy site. Kent Highway Services have not raised objections however to the traffic likely to be generated by this and other development.</li> <li>Existing urban area has a defined boundary that would be breached by permitting development at this location.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Any development that brings an urbanising effect to this area should be considered carefully. Access issues most likely could be overcome, not least as the developer is proposing only a limited amount of housing and Kent Highways have not raised objections.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	All land is available Willing developer (Persimmon Homes)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	No likely abnormal costs immediately apparent  Potential highways constraints with access along Boughton Lane particularly at its junction with Loose Road (A229) at Boughton Parade/Cripple Street, when considered cumulatively with other potential and already approved development.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable subject to transport/traffic issues being addressed

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	

2016 - 2021	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The previous assessment concluded as follows

*'This site at Boughton Lane is restricted primarily through a combination of access and character issues. At the examination for the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, the inspector refused an allocation on this site due to access issues and the change in character that the resulting development, and upgraded access, of this site would involve.*

*If Pickering Street, on the west of the site, were of a more appropriate standard, access could be taken from there with minimal impact on the countryside. However, access to this site cannot be taken from Pickering Street and would need to be taken across the eastern fields of the site – those bordering Boughton Lane.*

*The character of these fields is currently rural in character and despite the proximity of the urban boundary, this location is distinctly separate from the urban area of Maidstone. Taking access across the fields would require an approach road to be constructed that would significantly urbanise this location.*

*Development at this location is inappropriate for these reasons.'*

The proposers in resubmitting the site have provided further comments seeking to address the comments set out above. They indicated that the position of the access roadway was moved as a result of feedback from local consultation, from a position that ran northwards across to Boughton Lane to a position that runs eastwards to Boughton Lane. It is also contended that the community open space to be provided as part of the development will not result in the feared urbanisation/unacceptable change in the character of the area.

It is accepted that the view of the development would have no more of an urbanising influence than that of the existing development. That is because it is set back considerably from Boughton Lane and would be read with the Leonard Gould development. The open space to be secured would considerably mitigate the impact of the development.

However it is consider that the access should run northwards and not eastwards across the open space. This would result in less fragmentation of the open space.

ACCEPT

YIELD - 75

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-113
Site name/address	North Street, Barming
Landowner	Taylor Wimpey
Agent	Alex Anderson – Pegasus Group
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	10
Proposed yield	Up to 250 including the 35 currently proposed to be allocated
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to urban boundary
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>Currently arable land and orchards. Adjacent to North Street and residential area to the east. Residential area to south. Residential area to north/North Pole Road. Extension of arable land/countryside to west.</p> <p>Land has undulating topography which results in the land rising to the north of the site.</p> <p>The site is significant in scale and includes both cultivated agricultural land and orchards.</p>
Current use	Arable land and Orchards
Adjacent uses	Residential to north/east and south. Countryside and farmland to west.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Area of Local Landscape Importance Countryside location
Planning history	71/0403/MK3, MA/87/0495, MA/90/0588, MA/94/1691, MA/01/0664
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	<p>Considered prior to local plan 2000 and Considered within the SHLAA 2009</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation below from the 2000 Local Plan is below:-</p> <p>(4.243 From the arguments that I heard at the inquiry I have considered the impact of housing on this site from two main areas: from a distance to the south in Lower Road looking across the Medway valley; and from close to in North Street.</p> <p>4.244 Dealing with the distant views first, I found on my visits in both summer and winter that the site can be clearly seen from various places in Lower Road, particularly from directly to the south in views which were not illustrated by the objectors' landscape witness. In these views, this edge of Maidstone has an attractive, rather diffuse</p>

character, described by this witness as "... a quite subtle merging of town and country. ..." (MB/PR.104, paragraph 3.14).

4.245 At present the site contributes to the character and appearance of the area when seen from Lower Road because its openness contrasts with the housing development around it, and extends the rural character of the area to the west amongst that housing. The urban boundary is therefore not clear cut, and town and country merge in an attractive, subtle way. I have no doubt that this would change if the site were developed for housing since, even with the landscaping proposed, the green and open character of much of the site which I saw on my visits would be lost. The effect of housing, therefore, would be to consolidate the urban element in the area at the expense of the rural, and the subtlety of their merging would be lost.

4.246 I agree with the objectors that housing on the site would not be extend the urban area along the valley since there is housing along its northern and southern boundaries. However, to my mind the opposite effect, of reducing the countryside incursion amongst the houses, is equally harmful. I do not agree with the objectors that the site does not appear as an obvious part of the countryside, particularly in those views directly from the south which were not illustrated at the inquiry. I accept that the western boundary is well treed, but the site still appears open, in marked contrast to the urban area to the east.

4.247 The objection site is in an area which has no special landscape designation. However, I note the advice in paragraph 2.14 of PPG7 that the countryside should be protected for its own sake. Moreover, in Chapter 3 I have recommended that the Council should extend the Medway Valley ALLI to cover this area north of its present boundary. I conclude on this part of the issue, therefore, that housing on the site would materially harm the distant views of this part of Maidstone when seen from the south across the Medway valley.

4.248 I turn now to consider the effect of the proposal on North Street. Architecturally the appearance of North Street is dominated by modern housing. Nevertheless, the extensive views west and south-westwards across the objection site from the northern end of the Street, and the views due south along it and across the Medway valley, give it a rural character to be expected on the edge of the town. This would be completely changed by housing on the objection site, even with the area of open space proposed on the eastern edge and which it has been agreed would be included in a site specific policy. The rural views across the site, towards and beyond the shelter belt planting, would be replaced by views across urban open space towards housing.

Even the extensive landscaping which is illustrated cannot alter the change from a rural to an urban character and appearance.

4.249 My concern is reinforced when the illustrative road access proposals are considered. Whatever detailed design is chosen for the junctions proposed to give access to the objection site from North Street, they would introduce an urban form and scale wholly out of place in this largely rural setting. I note that traffic could be removed from the northern part of North Street, but this does not in any way overcome the harm that road proposals of this scale would cause.

4.250 I accept the value of some of the elements in the design concept, internal landscaping, footways and cycleways, for example, but they do not address my concerns which are to the principle of development.

4.251 For all these reasons I conclude on this issue that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of North Street, and the distant views of the area from Lower Road across the Medway valley.

Issue (b)

In paragraph 4.238 I found the need to provide sites for an additional 940 houses to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Moreover, it is clear from paragraph 4.700 that I have been unable to recommend enough sites to meet this need. Despite this, however, I have no doubt that the serious harm which I have identified in issue (a) is not outweighed

The need for additional housing could represent the overriding need referred to in paragraph 2.18 of PPG7 to justify the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, particularly in circumstances where land of lower quality may not be available. I also heard of the difficulties of farming the land because of its closeness to the town, its limited size and lack of facilities. As grade 2 land this site should be protected in the light of advice in PPG7, and the Council submitted a letter of objection to the development from MAFF. However, much of the land around Maidstone is in the best and most versatile category and, to meet the Structure Plan housing requirements, the Council has allocated land of grades 2, 3a and 3b quality. On some sites, MAFF has withdrawn its original objection to development recognising the need to provide housing land, and subject to the protection of adjoining farmland.

4.254 Whilst I note the advice in Annex B of PPG7, I am not convinced by the arguments about the difficulties of farming this site since, as MAFF notes, many relate more to ownership matters rather than the intrinsic land quality. The problems of proximity to housing could also be simply moved with the shift in development area boundary, although I accept

	<p>that a dense landscape area is proposed along the western boundary of the site. In this case I have no doubt that my recommendation is justified by my conclusions on issue (a) alone, but that the loss of grade 2 agricultural land reinforces my conclusion that the need for housing is not overriding).</p>
<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 21-1: Barming Slopes</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong enclosure by extensive woodlands to the north</li> <li>• Dramatically isolated church building</li> <li>• Large arable fields to the west</li> <li>• Small area of orchards in the north east</li> <li>• Long views out across the Medway to West Farleigh Medway Valley Side</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Moderate Sensitivity Assessment = Low Guideline = Improve and Reinforce</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Conserve traditional buildings and the striking isolated location of the church</li> <li>• Improve the definition of, and strengthen the boundary with, the urban edge</li> <li>• Improve the quality of existing boundaries</li> </ul> <p>The impact of development at this location is dependent on the extent of any proposal. Development could be confined to the North Street frontage, in effect maintaining the development pattern largely as it currently is. The open nature of the site leading up the slope to North Pole Road and Oaken Wood beyond would be maintained and the views from the southern bank of the Medway Valley would not be significantly changed.</p>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site has some ecological value.</p> <p><b>KCC Ecology Response:-</b> Previously provided detailed comments for proposed Strategic Allocations in 2012</p> <p>'Bell Farm The site is 100m south of Oaken Wood Local Wildlife Site, an extensive area of ancient woodland.</p> <p><i>Site Description</i> The site comprises a mixture of orchard fields and grass fields, with most of the field boundaries marked by hedgerows. The level of management of the grass fields cannot be determined but may include rough grassland areas.</p>

	<p><i>Habitat Indicators of Protected Species Presence</i></p> <p>Using Natural England's Standing Advice for guidance, the following features and habitats that indicate the potential for protected species presence on or near to the site have been identified:</p> <p>Woodland; Hedgerows; Grassland; Rough grassland.</p> <p><i>Summary of identified potential for ecological impacts</i></p> <p>The greatest constraint to the allocation of this site is the potential for impacts to the ancient woodland, with the NPPF advising that "<i>permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of...ancient woodland...unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss</i>". While the site is not directly adjacent to the ancient woodland/Local Wildlife Site, there would still need to be consideration to indirect impacts, for example as a result of recreational disturbance.</p> <p>We advise that there would be a need to undertake a preliminary ecological assessment of the site, which would provide detailed recommendations for additional specific surveys. The confirmed presence of protected species would result in the need for ecological mitigation measures.'</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>Site contains a variety of landscaping. No protected trees, some to the boundaries of the site.</p> <p>Detailed landscape comments previously provided for SHLAA assessment 2009.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2 agricultural land quality
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>A number of Grade II listed properties within the vicinity to the east of the site but outside of the boundaries of the site.</p> <p>No conservation areas within vicinity.</p> <p>Detailed heritage comments provided for SHLAA assessment 2009.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p><b>KCC Archaeology Response:-</b></p> <p>Site lies in area of general Iron Age and Romano-British potential; sites contains some outbuildings associated with post medieval farm complex of St Cuthberts; St Cuthberts Cottage Listed Building lies adjacent to site (Level 3).</p>
PROW (within or near site)	None
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main</li> </ul>	<p><b>KCC Highways Response:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties in Barming.</li> <li>• Site accessed from North Street.</li> </ul>

<p>highway network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of the restricted nature of North Street. It enjoys good access to the A26 Tonbridge Road via North Street, which has a good crash record, although there is a poor crash record at its junction with Tonbridge Road which may require mitigation. A semi-continuous footway link to the centre of Barming is provided on North Street and Heath Road; however parts of North Street have no footway and the road is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass without encroaching on to the highway verge.</li> <li>• All of the services within Barming are within walking and cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on Tonbridge Road are served by Bus Routes 6, 6A and 7, which provide a combined service to Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells every 15 minutes on weekdays.</li> </ul>
<p>Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barming Primary School 500m</li> <li>• Local Shops 500m</li> <li>• Adjacent to bus-stop for route 78 and 82 Buses 6 6a and 7 run along Tonbridge Road some 600m to the south</li> <li>• Within 1km to nearest GP surgery</li> <li>• East Farleigh Rail Station 2.3km</li> <li>• Barming Rail Station 2.9km</li> <li>• Maidstone East Rail Station 5.2km</li> <li>• Maidstone West Rail Station 3.8km</li> </ul>
<p>Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)</p>	<p>There is unlikely to be an impact upon existing residential amenity of properties within surrounding area, location of existing properties to eastern side of site will need to be considered to ensure no loss of privacy/overlooking. Similarly, with regard to impact upon Cedar Drive.</p>
<p>Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric</p>	<p>Utilities exist nearby within North Street adjoining the site. Could be supplied to the proposed site.</p>
<p>Air quality/noise</p>	<p>Adjacent to AQMA, but no issues raised. Noise unlikely to be an issue.</p>
<p>Land contamination</p>	<p>No land contamination</p>
<p>Flood Risk (zone/drainage)</p>	<p>Within flood zone 1 – low probability of flooding.</p>
<p>Suitability (assessment conclusion)</p>	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Good access to highway network and surrounding services.</li> <li>• Development would provide good housing yield.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual harm to Area of Local Landscape Importance.</li> <li>• Land provides some landscape and ecology quality.</li> <li>• Harm to existing semi rural character of area.</li> <li>• Long range views of the site are possible due to its sloping topography and proximity to the Medway Valley.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p>

	This site is adjacent to the urban area, and well-related to facilities. Access can be achieved and subject to further assessment of the possible development layout and relationship to the local highway network. The pattern of development within the locality is also varied and this site, infilling a space between existing development, is potentially suitable to provide a logical extension to the west of the urban boundary.
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing Landowner Interested developer (Taylor Wimpey)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	No immediately apparent likely abnormal costs or significant constraints
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated that the whole site could be delivered within these timescales
2016 - 2021	X
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'Whilst there may be some visual harm due to the sloping topography of the site and the visibility from the Medway Valley, suitable planting and a lower density development could assist in reducing any visual harm. Furthermore, whilst the site does contribute to the character of this area and local distinctiveness, the site is partially enclosed by some existing residential development to the south and north which is viewed in the context of this site. The site is also within a locally designated area, this designation is given little weight within the NPPF. I therefore reduce the weight given to the visual harm upon this area. I therefore consider the site is suitable for development.</i></p> <p><i>Given this location, the site could accommodate a range of dwellings for the housing market to this important residential area. Due to its siting forming a transition to the open countryside to the west, a lower density development would be more appropriate of 35dph. Furthermore, a suitable level of landscaping would be required within the site and to the west and north which may reduce the developable area.</i></p> <p><i>The developer considers that the site is available for development within the immediate period, this may be achievable with other sites requiring highway network improvements developed although some local highway improvements would be required as stated by KCC</i></p>

*Highways.*

*Overall, I consider that this site is suitable and I recommend that it is accepted for development.'*

The applicants are seeking the allocation of the entire site for development rather than the eastern extent of the site as currently proposed in the 2014 Reg. 18 consultation draft.

Development further to the west on the larger site would be detrimental to the character and openness of the area. This would result from its negating the role of the undeveloped land, when viewed across the Medway Valley, in defining the character of the area and the relationship between the urban area and the countryside beyond.

The views of the previous Local Plan Inspector set out above are also still relevant in this regard.

It is therefore considered that the development on the wider site should be rejected.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-112
Site name/address	South of Marden Road
Landowner	Mr P Garrod and Mr & Mrs W Brazil
Agent	DHA Planning
Greenfield/PDL	Predominantly Greenfield/Two yard areas PDL
Site area (ha)	2.03
Proposed yield	44
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites.

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site comprises rough grassland/pasture set back from Marden Road, the C68, and is located behind a small group of dwellings. The boundaries of the site, are marked by mature native hedges, which contain mature indigenous trees. Site is approximately level. The site is bound to the north by residential development, to the south and west by agricultural land, and to the east by woodland/orchard. Ponds are located in the south west of the site. Access is gained via the residential site to the north.
Current use	Rough grassland/pasture.
Adjacent uses	Agricultural, residential.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside.
Planning history	Subject of various applications relating to Homefields (the original dwelling located to the north of the site.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Unknown.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Would be screened in public views from Marden Road by existing built development to north, and from views from the KM302A public footpath by existing hedging and trees. However would be seen as an isolated urban development remote from Staplehurst.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• the pastoral land use and orchards, and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site (?). The sites consist of 7 grassland fields which are surrounded by hedgerows. The Kent Habitat Survey 2012 identified the fields as neutral grassland with areas of rank grassland and scrub. There are two ponds within the site and at least 10 ponds within 100m of the site. Reptiles, bats and GCN have been recorded on the site or within the surrounding area.</p> <p>(Unsure whether this relates to the correct site.)</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p>Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 12 of 1996 protects 2 individual trees and 2 groups of trees adjacent to the site, to the rear of properties in Lime Tree. There may also be other significant trees within hedgerows. There may be 'important' hedgerows on field boundaries.</p> <p>(Unsure whether this relates to the correct site.)</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>Grade 4.</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building,</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

conservation area)	
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Adjacent to historic farm complex of Hen and Duckhurst Farm.
PROW (within or near site)	The KM302A public footpath is located approximately 100m to the south.
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	Located to south of Marden Road, the C68, in 40mph zone. Access via existing residential development. No comments received from KCC Highways.
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Staplehurst village centre (approximately 0.8km), Railway station approximately 1km. Bus route along A229 serves Maidstone and Cranbrook/Hawkhurst
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Site abuts a small group of residential properties.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Relatively remote, but likely to be some services as there are other isolated properties in the vicinity.
Air quality/noise	Not applicable.
Land contamination	Not applicable.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zone 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is in a remote location and would be isolated from the RSC. It would appear incongruous and would be visually harmful to the open countryside. Ecological mitigation would be necessary.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowners Un-named developer interest
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Some potential costs relating to contamination from removal of existing yard areas.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

The previous assessment concluded as follows

*'The site is in a remote location and would be isolated from the RSC. It would appear incongruous and would be visually harmful to the open countryside. Access to the site would be from an inappropriate highway. Ecological mitigation would be necessary.'*

The proposer has indicated that, as land to the east has been allocated, this site should also be allocated. The land that appears to be referred to is that at Hen & Duckhurst Farm which lies on the north side of Marden Road north-east of the site.

However, it is considered that the development of the proposed site would be incongruous if developed in isolation and that the site referred to by the agent would not overcome this.

There have been no changes in the material circumstances of the site to warrant a different conclusion being reached.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-131
Site name/address	Land off Lenham Road Headcorn
Landowner	
Agent	Wealden Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.88
Proposed yield	25
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Approximately rectangular site extending southwards from Lenham Road. Some outbuildings and a pond (surrounded by trees) in south east corner of site. Surrounded by agricultural land on three sides, to north east of site is cricket pitch. Site boundaries marked by native hedges with some trees. The site is level.
Current use	Agricultural (grazing land)
Adjacent uses	Agricultural, tennis/cricket club adjoins site to north east (all associated building in north east, buffered from site by cricket pitch).
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside, SLA.
Planning history	63/0255/MK2 Outline application (residential development) - REFUSED
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Accepted in 2009 SHLAA (124).
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Would appear as an isolated development in the open countryside, despite existing screening would be quite visible from the highway.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area 43: Headcorn Pasturelands</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Good Sensitivity Assessment = High</p>

	<p>Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and hedgerows to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land use and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along Maidstone Road</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	The site is predominately a rough grassland field surrounded by a hedgerow. The area to the south of the field is a mixture of rough grassland and scrub. Reptiles and GCN have been recorded within the surrounding area. There is the potential protected/notable species to be present including GCN and reptiles to be present.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	Along boundaries and around pond; none protected or registered.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Not applicable.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Not applicable.
PROW (within or near site)	KH 606 approximately 150m to south west.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lenham Road is a classified highway, the C258, national speed limit.</li> <li>• A new site access would be required.</li> <li>• The site is not adjacent to existing residential development and access is from Lenham Road, which is a national speed limit road with no footways. If the site were to be developed then footways would need to be installed between the site and Knights Way and the speed limit would need to be reduced to 30mph.</li> <li>• The crash record for Lenham Road is concerning with 8 'slight' incidents within a distance of around 300M since 2006. Any development that increases the amount of traffic on Lenham Road in the vicinity would need to provide mitigation by way of improving this short stretch of road.</li> <li>• If site HO-135 were to be developed then site HO-132 would be adjacent to residential development and access to HO-132 could potentially be from both Lenham Road and HO-</li> </ul>

	<p>135. This would be beneficial as it would spread the traffic flow and also allow faster and more direct access to services in Headcorn.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no public transport to the site and this would need to be addressed with a new service. Again this would logically take in the development at HO-135.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Headcorn village centre (approximately 1.5km); minimum walk along public highway with no pavement of approximately 0.5km. New doctors surgery and school located approximately 0.5km to south, accessible via a public footpath.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Not applicable – no immediate neighbours.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Relatively remote, but likely to be some services as there are other isolated properties in the vicinity.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be a problem. Potential for some disturbance from the adjacent cricket ground and tennis club
Land contamination	Unlikely
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zone 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is in a remote location and would be isolated from the RSC. It would appear incongruous and would be visually harmful to the open countryside. Highway mitigation (improvements to Lenham Road) would be required. Ecological mitigation would be necessary.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
<p>Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	<p>Willing landowner Interested developer</p>
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
<p>Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered</p>	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated these timescales
2016 – 2021	X
2021 – 2026	

2026 - 2031	
-------------	--

<p><b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b></p> <p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'The site is in a remote location and would be isolated from the RSC. It would appear incongruous and would be visually harmful to the open countryside.</i> <i>REJECT'</i></p> <p>The key question in relation to this site and the re-submitted site immediately adjoining it (HO-132) is whether there has been any material change in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment.</p> <p>It remains the view that development on this site (and that adjoining) would extend Headcorn too far into the countryside beyond the current extent of the village. Development of this field and that adjoining it, in addition to the field already proposed to be allocated, would be harmful to the current openness of the countryside hereabouts</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0</p>
--

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-132
Site name/address	Lenham Road, Headcorn
Landowner	Unknown
Agent	Wealden Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	1.21
Proposed yield	35 dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Approximately rectangular site extending southwards from Lenham Road. Surrounded by agricultural land. Site boundaries marked by native hedges with some trees. The site is level.
Current use	Agricultural (grazing land)
Adjacent uses	Agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside, SLA.
Planning history	MA/82/0489 Ground floor extension (Sydney House – possibly GIS error) – APPROVED  63/0255/MK2 Outline application (residential development) - REFUSED
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Accepted in 2009 SHLAA (124).
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Would appear as an isolated development in the open countryside, despite existing screening would be quite visible from the highway.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area 43: Headcorn Pasturelands</p> <p>Key characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Good Sensitivity Assessment = High Guidelines – Conserve</p>

	<p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and hedgerows to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land use and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along Maidstone Road</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	Grassland field which is surrounded by hedgerows. There are records of GCN and reptiles in the surrounding area. Appears to be a hay field so may have less ecological interest than HO-131 (adjacent site).
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	Along boundaries; none protected or registered.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Not applicable.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Not applicable.
PROW (within or near site)	KH 606 approximately 50m to south west.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lenham Road is a classified highway, the C258, national speed limit.</li> <li>• A new site access would be required.</li> <li>• The site is not adjacent to existing residential development and access is from Lenham Road, which is a national speed limit road with no footways. If the site were to be developed then footways would need to be installed between the site and Knights Way and the speed limit would need to be reduced to 30mph.</li> <li>• The crash record for Lenham Road is concerning with 8 'slight' incidents within a distance of around 300M since 2006. Any development that increases the amount of traffic on Lenham Road in the vicinity would need to provide mitigation by way of improving this short stretch of road.</li> <li>• If site HO-135 were to be developed then site HO-132 would be adjacent to residential development and access to HO-132 could potentially be from both Lenham Road and HO-135. This would be beneficial as it would spread the traffic flow and also allow faster and more direct access to services in Headcorn.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no public transport to the site and this would need to be addressed with a new service. Again this would logically take in the development at HO-135.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Headcorn village centre (approximately 1km); minimum walk along public highway with no pavement of approximately 0.3km. New doctors surgery and school located approximately 0.3km to south, accessible via a public footpath.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Not applicable – no immediate neighbours.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Relatively remote, but likely to be some services as there are other isolated properties in the vicinity.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue
Land contamination	Unlikely
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zone 2 or 3.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is in a remote location and would be isolated from the RSC. It would appear incongruous and would be visually harmful to the open countryside. Highway mitigation (improvements to Lenham Road) would be required. Ecological mitigation would be necessary.

### 3. AVAILABILITY

Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner and developer
Availability conclusion	Available

### 4. ACHIEVABILITY

Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

### Timing (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)

now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated these timescales
2016 – 2021	X
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

### 5. CONCLUSIONS

The previous assessment concluded as follows  <i>'The site is in a remote location and would be isolated from the RSC. It would appear incongruous and would be visually harmful to the open countryside.'</i>
--

*REJECT.'*

The key question in relation to this site and the re-submitted site immediately adjoining it (HO-132) is whether there has been any material change in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment.

It remains the view that development on this site (and the adjoining site) would extend Headcorn too far into the countryside beyond the current extent of the village. Development of this field and that adjoining it, in addition to the field already proposed to be allocated, would be harmful to the current openness of the countryside hereabouts

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-134
Site name/address	Land rear of Kent Cottage Grigg Lane/East of Knaves Acre Headcorn
Landowner	
Agent	Graham Norton Wealden Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.2
Proposed yield	5
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to rural settlement
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites/Local plan rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Approximately rectangular site extending northwards from Knaves Acre development to the rear of land associated with Kent House. Site boundaries marked by native hedges with trees. The site is level.
Current use	Agricultural (grazing land)
Adjacent uses	Agricultural to north and east, residential to south and west.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Open countryside, SLA.
Planning history	MA/80/1119 Outline application for erection of single detached dwelling and garage – REFUSED
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Would appear as a visually incongruous extension to the existing village into surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area 43: Headcorn pasturelands</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Reservoirs along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drainage ditches running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Sparse development with scattered farms and small hamlets</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oaks within pasture and as mature hedgerow trees</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Good Sensitivity Assessment = High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low</li> </ul>

	<p>Weald</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and hedgerows to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land use and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along Maidstone Road</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	Grassland Field which is surrounded by mature trees. Potential for bats to roost in the trees. There are ponds within the surrounding area so there is potential for GCN to be present.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 3 of 1978 protects individual trees on land to the east of plot B. There are also significant trees on site boundaries which are likely to constrain the developable area. There may be 'important' hedgerows on site boundaries.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Not applicable.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Not applicable.
PROW (within or near site)	KH 606 approximately 50m to east.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Comments as per HO-133. Site access is more difficult and would be via a single track private road between existing residential properties. If the track were improved to highways standards and the site designed to allow end to end visibility on the track then the site would be considered suitable for up to 5 properties.</p> <p>(HO – 133 comments:</p> <p>Site accessed from Knaves Acre which is a residential no through road. The road has a good safety record and access to the wider road network would be via Oak Lane to the south and Oak Lane and Forge Lane to the north. Public Transport and access to services is available around 400m away in the centre of Headcorn. From a Highways perspective the site is considered suitable for low scale development (up to 5 properties), directly fronting onto Knaves Acre.)</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Mainly located in Headcorn village centre (approximately 0.45km) accessible via highways with pavements.
Impacts on existing residential	Site abuts 3 adjacent residential properties. Possible

amenity (including access to open space)	disturbance to occupiers in Knaves Acre by way of increased traffic movements.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Good.
Air quality/noise	Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be an issue
Land contamination	Unlikely
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zones 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Would appear as a reasonably organic extension to the existing village, logical in respect of existing settlement boundary. The site is in a sustainable location in respect of facilities and services. There is a potential route to provide access from Knaves Acre although this would require improvement. Ecological mitigation may be necessary. Protected and non-protected trees and hedgerows may be constraint on development of the site.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner and developer.
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Highway improvements to access required.
Achievability conclusion	Achievable.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated these timescales
2016 – 2021	X
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Would appear as a reasonably organic extension to the existing village, logical in respect of existing settlement boundary. The site is in a sustainable location in respect of facilities and services. There is a potential route to provide access from Knaves Acre although this would require improvement. Ecological mitigation may be necessary. Protected and non-protected trees and hedgerows may be constraint on development of the site.'</i>	
The re-submission seeks to identify access to the site from the east rather than Knaves Acre as that access is limited in width and amounts to little more than a footpath/right of way. Access from the east would allow access from the allocated land to the east.	
ACCEPT	

YIELD - 5

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-137
Site name/address	109 and 111 Tonbridge Road
Landowner	
Agent	Wealden Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.2
Proposed yield	8 Houses
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Urban
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted Call for Sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>Site is located within the urban area on the south side of the A26 Tonbridge Road. It is located within a predominantly residential area although some of the larger houses along Tonbridge Road have been converted to business use. There is a nursery, dentists and a surgery in the area.</p> <p>There is no highway access to the site. Some of the garden along this side of the road have been recently developed for housing and now comprise All Angels Close. Views of the site can be obtained from this new street.</p>
Current use	Garden
Adjacent uses	Residential
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	<p>Not allocated for development within the Local Plan 2000.</p> <p>No landscape restrictions in place.</p>
Planning history	<p>None relevant</p> <p><b>On adjacent land to west at All Angels Close</b></p> <p>12/0381: Erection of two detached dwellings including integral garages with access to Tonbridge Road via All Angels Close permitted under (MA/08/2323): APPROVED</p> <p>11/2024: An application to modify one dwelling approved under MA/08/2323 with the erection of a single storey rear sun room and a 900mm brick wall to the front/side to replace approved 900mm palisade fence: APPROVED</p> <p>11/0758: Erection of a detached two and half storey house with integral garage with dropped kerb access off the Tonbridge Road (Amendments to previously scheme previously proved under MA/08/2323): APPROVED</p> <p>11/0679: Erection of three dwellings comprising one detached dwelling with integral garage and two semi detached dwellings with access to Tonbridge Road</p>

	<p>via access permitted under (MA/08/2323): REFUSED</p> <p>11/0557: An application for a non material amendment to MA/08/2323 (Demolition of existing building and erection 1no. detached dwelling and 12no. two-storey terraced dwellings in four blocks and associated works including access and parking ) being alterations to Plot 1: REFUSED</p> <p>08/2323: Demolition of existing building and erection 1no. detached dwelling and 12no. two-storey terraced dwellings in four blocks and associated works including access and parking: APPROVED</p> <p>08/0900: Demolition of existing building and erection of fourteen new dwellings with new access and landscaping: REFUSED: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Site is located within the urban area on the south side of the A26 Tonbridge Road. It is located within a predominantly residential area although some of the larger houses along Tonbridge Road have been converted to business use. There is a nursery, dentists and a surgery in the area.</p> <p>There is no highway access to the site. Some of the garden along this side of the road have been recently developed for housing and now comprise All Angels Close. Views of the site can be obtained from this new street.</p>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>No SSSI's or LWS's within or adjacent to site.</p> <p>2 residential gardens which has a mixture of mature trees and rough grassland. The gardens are surrounded by hedgerows. Potential for protected/notable species to be present including reptiles and roosting bats within the trees.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>No trees or woodland subject to TPO on site or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>There are no TPOs currently on this site but there are significant 'back garden' trees. However, these would only be protectable if they are prominent from a public place.</p> <p>There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p>There are no 'important' hedgerows.</p>
Agricultural land quality	N/A
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	None.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	None.

PROW (within or near site)	None.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Access into the site would be via All Angels Close which has good visibility of Tonbridge Road in both directions</p> <p>Regular bus services run along Tonbridge Road which run into town and to the train stations.</p> <p>Within good and safe and walking distance of local services and facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties on Tonbridge Road.</li> <li>• Site access from the A26 Tonbridge Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys direct access to the A26 Tonbridge Road, which has a relatively poor crash record, although the majority of these crashes have been minor in nature and should be set in the context of the high peak time traffic flows into central Maidstone.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to the effect of the development on local air quality.</li> <li>• The site is within walking and cycling distance of many of the services within central Maidstone via continuous footway links and is close to Maidstone West Station.</li> <li>• The nearby bus stops on Tonbridge Road are served by Bus Routes 6, 6A, 7, and 85, which provide a combined frequency of six buses per hour to Maidstone Town Centre on weekdays. The site is a short walk from Maidstone West Station, which is served by half-hourly rail services to Strood and hourly services to Paddock Wood and Tonbridge on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	Local shops, public transport, health facilities, and St Michaels C of E Primary School and Bower Grove School are all within 1km of the site.
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Unlikely to cause loss of privacy to surrounding houses.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Within the urban area surrounded by residential development. Utility infrastructure in vicinity.
Air quality/noise	<p>No noise issues apparent on site or in the area.</p> <p>Site is within an Air Quality Management Area and may have an impact on the Fountain Lane/Hermitage Lane hotspot and the town centre hotspot.</p>
Land contamination	<p>None.</p> <p>Site has good access to public open space. Parks such as Clare Park and Cornwallis Recreation Ground are within walking distance.</p>
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in Flood Zones 2 or 3
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is back garden land (greenfield) within the urban area. Back garden development is generally

	resisted and although this site is adjacent to an existing similar development that has recently been completed, the change in guidance and the cumulative impact mean that further development of gardens would be harmful to the character of the area and be overdevelopment.
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Site is available Willing developer (Wealden Homes)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Back garden development is generally resisted and although this site is adjacent to an existing similar development that has recently been completed, the change in guidance and the cumulative impact mean that further development of gardens would be harmful to the character of the area and be overdevelopment.'</i>	
There have been no material changes in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment to warrant a different conclusion being reached.	
Given the small size of the site, the best approach appears to be via the planning application process.	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-139
Site name/address	41 And 56 Valley Drive
Landowner	Not known
Agent	Graham Norton – Wealden Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	1
Proposed yield	7-8 Detached dwellings
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to urban boundary
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The application site lies within both the rural and urban area of Loose south of Maidstone town centre. The site is at the southern end of a residential cul-de-sac to the west of the Loose Road, accessed via Lancet Lane and Waldron Drive. Currently the site comprises two substantial detached bungalows with extensive gardens. The rear half of the application site is within the designated Area of Local Landscape Importance and Southern Anti-coalescence belt.</p> <p>The northern part of the land where the existing dwellings are placed is reasonably level before sloping downwards in a southerly direction. To the east and west are residential curtilages' and to the north the access from the cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The site represents the end dwellings of the cul-de-sac with rear gardens extending southwards towards the Loose Valley. Residential development extends to the north with green areas and a more rural and historic character to the residential development of the south and east. Immediately to the east of the site is an area of allotment gardens.</p>
Current use	Residential garden land. Occupied by two detached dwellings.
Adjacent uses	Predominantly residential
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Part countryside and part urban area Area of Local Landscape Importance Southern Anti-coalescence belt Loose Conservation Area
Planning history	<p>There is recent planning history at this site for a residential development. The principle of development at this site was considered acceptable but the details were considered harmful. The planning history is listed below:-</p> <p>14/0061- Demolition of annexe and outbuilding at 41 Valley Drive inclusive of erection of double garage and driveway with existing driveway reinstated to garden land; demolition of 56 Valley Drive to enable redevelopment being the erection of</p>

	<p>6 detached houses with garaging/parking served by private access road with dropped kerb driveway access to bungalow on plot: Refused – Appeal dismissed 19/08/2014</p> <p>13/0886 – Demolition of 41 &amp; 56 Valley Drive and the erection of 7No. detached houses with garaging/parking, gated private access road with a dropped kerb access to plot 1 via private drive; and site landscaping: Refused – Appeal dismissed 5/12/2013</p> <p>11/1286 – Demolition of 41 &amp; 56 Valley Drive and the erection of 8 no. detached houses with garaging/parking space, access and associated landscaping: Refused – Appeal dismissed 19/11/2012</p> <p>04/1673 – Refused 04/0619 – Refused – Appeal dismissed</p>
<p>Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012:</p> <p>Adjacent to:- Landscape Character Area 27-8 – Loose Valley</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water comprising the Loose Stream, mill ponds and springs</li> <li>• Steep wooded valley sides</li> <li>• Traditional mill buildings and cottages – stone built or weather boarded with slate roofs</li> <li>• Mature native woodland</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment = Very Good Sensitivity Assessment = Very High Guideline = Conserve</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands.</li> <li>• Conserve the special landscape quality provided by the dominance of water in the form of a river, mill ponds and springs.</li> <li>• Conserve and appropriately manage the mill ponds for landscape and biodiversity value.</li> <li>• Have regard to the Loose Valley Conservation Partnership and their management plan, together with individual organisations of significance such as the Valley Conservation Society.</li> <li>• Conserve and appropriately manage wooded valley sides.</li> <li>• Avoid further new development to maintain the rural, tranquil character.</li> </ul>

<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site has some ecological value.</p> <p><b>KCC Ecology Response:-</b> Detailed comments have been provided for planning application: MA/11/1286 in response to an ecology survey submitted as part of this application (detailed below):-</p> <p>We are satisfied that the Ecological Survey has adequately considered the potential for impacts on protected species as a result of the proposed development. The survey has assessed that there is minimal habitat present to be suitable for protected species. We did have concerns that the area of scrub in the garden of no.41 would be suitable habitat for reptiles – however I have spoken to the ecologist who has stated that the scrub is so dense that there is low potential of reptiles being present.</p> <p>The allotments adjacent to the proposed development site do contain suitable habitat for reptiles. If planning permission is granted a reptile fence must be erected between the site and the allotments to prevent any reptiles moving on to the site if suitable habitat for reptiles is created during development works. The reptile fence must be removed once the development is finished.</p> <p>The site does have suitable habitat for nesting birds. If works are scheduled to be carried out during that time an ecologist must examine the site prior to works starting – if any nesting birds are identified no works must be carried out within that area until all the young have fledged.</p> <p>The landscaping for the proposed development is using native species which is welcomed. However other enhancements can be incorporated in to the proposed development.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p><b>Tree protection status</b> Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 11 of 2004 protects 1 group of trees to the north of the site and 5 individual trees within the site. These have been acknowledged in an appeal decision as being important in screening views into the site.</p> <p><b>Ancient Woodlands</b> There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p><b>Hedgerow status</b> There are no 'important' hedgerows.</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>The site falls under land predominantly in urban use.</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> None affected <b>Conservation Areas:</b> The site lies adjacent to the Loose Valley Conservation Area but is separated from it by the trackway of Kirkdale and a substantial tree screen. Sensitive development of housing at a suitable density which retains and reinforces this screening should not adversely affect the setting of the</p>

	<p>conservation area.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> None affected</p> <p><b>Archaeology:</b> No known implications</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p><b>KCC Archaeology Response:-</b></p> <p>Nothing known (Level 4).</p>
PROW (within or near site)	<p>There is a public footpath KM52 to the west of the site which leads to the bottom of the valley. There is a further footpath to the east of the site (KM180) between nos. 35 &amp; 37 Valley Drive linking to the Loose Road.</p>
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p><b>KCC Highways Response:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential access off Valley Drive.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing development with a good crash record and good links to the strategic road network.</li> <li>• The site is within walking and cycling distance of many residential areas and amenities.</li> <li>• There are half hourly bus services into Maidstone Town Centre; the bus stop is located on Loose Road. There are train stations within the vicinity of Maidstone Town Centre.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 3.3m of Maidstone East Rail Station.</li> <li>• Within 1m of local shops and GP services.</li> <li>• Within 0.5m of local school and bus stop with a regular bus service serving Loose Road between the Town Centre and villages to the south.</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>There would be limited impact upon existing residential amenity of properties within vicinity depending on residential layout, may be a loss of privacy/overlooking to rear of existing properties within Valley Drive.</p>
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	<p>Utilities exist nearby within Valley Drive and can be provided within the proposed site.</p>
Air quality/noise	<p>Adjacent to AQMA, but no issues raised</p> <p>Noise unlikely to be an issue</p>
Land contamination	<p>No issues raised.</p>
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p>The site is not within a flood zone. No flooding issues anticipated at this site.</p>
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Good access to highway network and surrounding services.</li> <li>• Development would extend existing residential cul-de-sac with an intensified pattern of development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive visual harm to Area of Local Landscape Importance.</li> <li>• Land provides some landscape and ecology quality.</li> <li>• Harm to existing semi rural character of area.</li> <li>• Significantly contributes to the character of the area.</li> <li>• Poor housing yield.</li> <li>• Impact upon protected trees within the site.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual harm to the appearance and character of the Loose Valley Conservation Area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u> The principle for development at this site was established within the inspector's appeal decision of 11/1286.</p> <p>There are a number of environmental/streetscape constraints at the site which would need to be fully considered.</p> <p>To-date, revised proposals have failed to achieve this to the satisfaction of subsequent inspectors.</p> <p>This is a site that should be dealt with through the planning application process due to the low yield.</p>
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner Developer involved (Wealden Homes)
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	Tree Preservation Order within and adjoining site No other immediately apparent constraints.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
<p>The principle for development at this site was established within the inspector's appeal decision of 11/1286.</p> <p>There are a number of environmental/streetscape constraints at the site which would need to be fully considered.</p> <p>To-date, revised proposals have failed to achieve this to the satisfaction of subsequent inspectors. This is a site that should be dealt with through the planning application process due to the low yield.</p> <p>REJECT YIELD - 0</p>	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-149
Site name/address	East of South Road, Marden
Landowner	Not known
Agent	Hillreed/Persimmon Group
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	2.51
Proposed yield	50-60
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local Plan Rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site lies in the open countryside adjacent to the village envelope on the eastern periphery of Marden village, and approximately 600m from the village 'centre'.</p> <p>The site is a flat, open field, and is relatively featureless in character. It borders residential properties on South Road to the west and the rear of a number of detached dwellings on Howland Road to the north. Howland Road also forms the eastern boundary of the site, which has a strong hedgerow along its length. There are clear views into the site along this boundary.</p> <p>To southern end of the site has a strong hedgerow and trees along its perimeter. There are four large detached properties in close proximity to the south eastern boundary, which are accessed via a narrow lane along part of the site perimeter. The dwellings do not have clear views into the site due to the number of mature trees in this area.</p> <p>When standing on the public footpath in the south west corner of the site, the character and appearance of the site is wholly in keeping with the agricultural land to the south and to the east beyond Howland Road. In this view there is a scatter of buildings around the edge of the site, but they are not enough to enclose it.</p> <p>There are no long range views into the site but as described above, the open countryside further east is visible. The site is very visible from Howland Road when travelling from the east towards Marden village, and at present forms an attractive gateway to the village, owing much to the strong hedgerow at the site's boundary.</p> <p>Looking across the site from the east, the edge of Marden created by houses in South Road is rather harsh, but from Howland Road at least, this is a</p>

	distant view softened by the site itself and the hedge on its eastern boundary.
Current use	Rough grassland – horses were grazing on site.
Adjacent uses	Residential, agricultural
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Site is in the open countryside, adjacent to the village envelope. No other planning designations.
Planning history	None
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	Yes – (DH0303) Inspector raised many issues including: Several of the buildings around the site are listed, and the urbanising effect of houses on the site would significantly alter their setting, reinforcing my concern about the effect of housing on the site. I conclude on this issue, therefore, that housing on this site would materially harm the character and appearance of the area. I have no doubt that the access illustrated at the inquiry would materially add to this harm, but the impact of housing itself, whichever access is proposed, is enough in my view to justify my recommendation.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>There are no long range views into the site but as described above, the open countryside further east is visible. The site is very visible from Howland Road when travelling from the east towards Marden village, and at present forms an attractive gateway to the village, owing much to the strong hedgerow at the site’s boundary.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012: Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald:</p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Small fields with orchards, pasture, ponds and watercourses enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost</li> <li>• Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed for intensive arable cultivation Sparse scattered small woodlands</li> <li>• Winding roads with wide verges bounded by ditches and mixed native hedgerows</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden</li> </ul> <p>Condition: Good Sensitivity: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture</li> </ul>

	<p>and oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land and orchards and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads and hamlets</li> <li>• Resist further linear development and intrusive elements along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>KCC describe the site as a grassland field with patches of rough grassland/scrub throughout. It is surrounded by hedgerows and the hedgerow on the southern boundary is very dense. Potential for protected/notable species to be present - in particular reptiles, breeding birds, bats and GCN.</p> <p>The site is considered <b>level 2</b> in terms of ecological importance = <b>potential for moderate ecological impacts.</b></p> <p>KCC Ecology summarise - Suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site. Near to designated site (including international, national, local and BAP habitat) with potential impact pathways. Likely level of significance is lower than (1) due to factors such as location (e.g. in relation to protected species ranges) and the extent of adjacent natural/semi-natural habitats.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p>No TPOs or ancient woodland nearby</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>Grade 3 agricultural land</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p><b>Historic Buildings:</b></p> <p>To the north the site shares a boundary with The Old House and Poachers Keep/ Pastures End, two Grade II listed buildings. These now appear as edge-of-village properties, being joined to the village centre by the long ribbon of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century development along Howland Road. Although they back on to open countryside, they have no direct visual or functional relationship with</p>

	<p>it.</p> <p>On the opposite side of the road at the north-eastern corner of the site lies the former farm group of Bridgehurst Farm. The farmhouse is Grade II listed and the adjacent barn and Bridgehurst Oast contribute to its setting and significance and should be considered as non-designated heritage assets. The group is separated by a small parcel of open land from the ribbon development along Howland Road and maintains a rural atmosphere which it will be important to protect.</p> <p>To the south lies Stone Pit Barn and Stone Pit Farmhouse, both Grade II listed buildings, again forming a good farmstead group in a rural setting which is important to their significance.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Other Comments:</b> In many ways this site may be seen as a logical extension of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century South Road estate. It might be possible to sympathetically develop the land for housing if care is taken to preserve the rural settings of Bridgehurst Farm and Stone Pit Farm and to soften the impact on The Old House and Poachers Keep/ Pastures End. A low density of development would therefore be appropriate, concentrating buildings in the south-western quadrant of the site and establishing substantial planted boundaries to the north, east and south.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	No known implications.
PROW (within or near site)	There is a PROW (KM276) running west/east along the southern boundary of the site which connects Albion Road to Howland Road
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties in Marden.</li> <li>• Potential for access from South Road and/or Howland Road, although KCCs preference would be for the principal vehicular access to be taken from South Road, due to the poor forward visibility on Howland Road and its relatively poor crash record at this location. This would require South Road to be enhanced to current highway standards, including the provision of a continuous foot/cycleway link into the site.</li> <li>• The site enjoys good access to the B2079 High Street via South Road and Howland Road, which have a relatively good crash record and a continuous footway link to the village centre.</li> <li>• All of the village services within Marden, including the railway station – which is served by half-hourly train services to Ashford, Staplehurst,</li> </ul>

	<p>Paddock Wood, Tonbridge and London Charing Cross – are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on High Street are served by Bus Route 26, which provides a service to Maidstone, Yalding and Goudhurst every two hours on weekdays. It may be necessary to extend this service closer to the site depending on the quantum of development proposed.</p>
<p>Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school</p>	<p>All key services are within 1.2km of site (the primary school being furthest away). The majority of services (shop, pub, library, medical centre, train station, bus stop, are less than 1km from centre of site, some less than 500m.</p>
<p>Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)</p>	<p>The site is enclosed by Howland Road to the north and east, residential properties on South Road to the west, and a strong hedgerow to the south. It is not used as formal open space. However, development on this site would impact on the existing residential amenity of properties along South Road. A couple of these properties (south west and north west extremes) are very close to the site boundary and have clear and uninterrupted views of the site and open countryside to the east. The three properties to the north also have uninterrupted views across the site to the south.</p>
<p>Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric</p>	<p>Considering site abuts the existing developed area one would not expect any issues regarding utilities</p>
<p>Air quality/noise</p>	<p>No known issues</p>
<p>Land contamination</p>	<p>No known issues</p>
<p>Flood Risk (zone/drainage)</p>	<p>The site is not in Flood Zone 2 or 3</p> <p>However, the EA recommend the following:</p> <p><u>Marden and Harrietsham Drainage Strategy</u></p> <p>We recommend a local drainage strategy be developed into which all the sites should contribute to, rather than each site considering site drainage independently. A local drainage strategy will likely result in a more efficient local drainage infrastructure.</p>
<p>Suitability (assessment conclusion)</p>	<p>This is a green-field site located within the open countryside adjacent to the village envelope. Several buildings around the site are listed and the character and appearance of the site is wholly in keeping with the agricultural land to the south and east. The site is clearly visible from the eastern boundary. Development of this site would extend the village boundary to the east, significantly alter the character of the area, and destroy the existing attractive gateway to the village.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing developer
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer previously indicated these timescales
2016 - 2021	X
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Development of this site would negatively impact on the nearby listed buildings, and extend the village boundary to the east, significantly altering the character of the area.'</i>	
The material circumstances of this site and its considerations have not changed since the previous assessment.	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-150
Site name/address	Land North of Vicarage Road Yalding
Landowner/Client	Millwood Designer Homes/Mr A Flaherty
Agent	Mr Peter Court ; Peter Court Associates
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	3.03
Proposed yield	60
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to settlement of Yalding
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local Plan rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	Large area of unmanaged woodland with a number of unofficial paths running through. The land drops gently to the south. Public footpath KM192A runs along the north boundary which is open to the path. Beyond this are grazing fields and some woodland. To the east is an arable field. The south boundary is entirely bounded by houses on Vicarage Road (some within 20m) and a narrow strip of the site runs between the dwellings 'Holbrook' and 9 Vicarage Road (potential access). To the west are houses on Blunden Lane and Mount Avenue (within 10m).
Current use	Woodland
Adjacent uses	Residential agriculture
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Greensand Ridge Special Landscape Area MBWLP 2000 policy ENV34
Planning history	Various outline applications for residential development 60's, 70's and 80's that were all refused.  <u>Most Recent</u>  MA/89/1718 - Outline application for a residential development WITHDRAWN
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Site would potentially be visible from public footpath, Mount Avenue and Blunden Lane, although scope to use woodland to screen. Significant change to character of the landscape due to loss of woodland. Visible in short and medium distance views of the village. No impact in terms of the long distance views.  Landscape Character Area 38: Yalding Farmlands  Key Characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reservoirs and water bodies along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>• Drains running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>• Enclosed pasture</li> <li>• Frequent orchards</li> <li>• Parkland landscape surrounding Hunton Court</li> <li>• Historic settlement of Yalding</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment Very Good Sensitivity Assessment High</p> <p>Conserve Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve orchards and the traditional small scale field pattern</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of existing development</li> <li>• Conserve the historic parkland landscape around Hunton Park</li> <li>• Conserve the rural setting of traditional buildings and farmhouses</li> <li>• Conserve distinctive ragstone walling</li> <li>• Conserve the undeveloped character of the landscape</li> <li>• Resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Avoid linear infill development along roads</li> <li>• Soften the impact of agricultural buildings and fruit equipment storage areas with native planting</li> <li>• Increase habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>The site is a greenfield site comprising of unmanaged woodland. It is likely therefore to be of high ecological value.</p> <p>The site is a woodland so high potential of protected/notable species being present within the site. Species include roosting bats, reptiles, dormice, GCN, flora, breeding birds. Good connectivity to the surrounding area.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>No trees subject to TPO on site or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Mature woodland. Several individual trees and groups of trees of varied species which may be considered to be of wider amenity value and worthy of protection.</p>
Agricultural land quality	N/A
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	N/A
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Site lies on River Terrace Gravels which have

	potential for rare and important palaeolithic remains.
PROW (within or near site)	Public footpath KM192A runs along the north boundary and crosses a possible access into the site from Mount Avenue.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Potential access off Mount Avenue, Blunden Lane or Vicarage Lane.</p> <p>Regular bus services runs to Maidstone and Laddingford and to the train stations on weekdays.</p> <p>Within good walking distance of local services and facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties within Yalding.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Vicarage Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the B2010 High Street via Vicarage Road, which has a good crash record. There are continuous footway links between the site and Yalding village centre, although it may be necessary to extend the footway on Vicarage Road to the site access.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Yalding Station 2.5km  Maidstone East Station 11.1km  Bus stops 250-300m  GP Surgery Benover Road 1.2km  Post office/shop 1km  Yalding Primary School 450m  Hunton Primary School 1.9km</p> <p>All of the village services within Yalding are within walking and cycling distance of the site .</p> <p>Yalding Hill is served by Nu-Venture Bus route 23  The village is also served by Nu-Venture Bus route 26 (via Vicarage Road).</p> <p>Bus route 23 is from Maidstone to Yalding and Laddingford. This is an hourly service Monday to Saturday and is operated by Nu-Venture:  Hourly from M/S to site from approx 0900 to 1830  To M/S from site from approx 0730 to 1700</p> <p>Bus route 26 serves Yalding from Maidstone to Goudhurst via Hunton: This is a 2-hourly service Monday to Saturday and is operated by Nu-Venture:  From M/S to site 2-hourly from approx 10:15 to 17:40 (Mon-Fri only) otherwise 16:00  To M/S from site 2-hourly from approx 0740 (school days) to 1400</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	Unlikely to cause loss of privacy to surrounding houses.
Availability of utilities infrastructure –	Immediately adjacent to a rural settlement could be

e.g. water/gas/electric	connected to existing mains supply.
Air quality/noise	No noise issues apparent on site.  Site is not within an Air Quality Management Area.
Land contamination	None
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Flood Zone 1
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is a wooded area on the edge of the village. It would have a significant impact on the character of the area and this change, loss of woodland, ecological impacts are likely to be unacceptable.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Whole site available Willing developer (Millwood Designer Homes) Willing landowner (previously submitted)
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	There would appear to be no abnormal costs or constraints associated with this site other than the extensive tree clearance.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'The site is a wooded area on the edge of the village. It would have a significant impact on the character of the area and this change, loss of woodland, ecological impacts are likely to be unacceptable.'</i>	
Whilst there is now a developer on-board, there have been no changes in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment that would lead to a different conclusion.	
REJECT	
YIELD -0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-151
Site name/address	Church Farm, Maidstone Road, Marden
Landowner	E W Wingrove & Son
Agent	B J Reid
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	30.44
Proposed yield	500+ houses plus retail
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural – Outside/adjacent Marden RSC village boundary in open countryside.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site comprises an extensive tract of agricultural land, divided into large fields, which is used for the cultivation of turf. The site is situated to the north of the railway line at Marden. The site is generally level. Access to the site is from the B2079 Maidstone Road. The access track into the site serves the property Orchard View and the small complex agricultural buildings at Church Farm.</p> <p>The boundaries to the site are demarked by hedgerows. Centrally located within the site are two reservoirs used for the irrigation of the turf. There are also at least a further 3 small ponds within the site and further ponds immediately beyond the western boundary.</p> <p>To the north and east the site adjoins further agricultural fields. The western boundary adjoins the substantial grounds of the property Olivers, which is accessed from Pattenden Lane, and further to the south the commercial unit occupied by Claygate and a field to the rear of the Crest Industrial Estate.</p> <p>The southern boundary of the site abuts the railway line, and gives access to the northern platform of Marden station. The site excludes and skirts to the north of the property The Old Vicarage, which fronts Maidstone Road, and the fields to the rear of this property.</p>
Current use	Agriculture: turf growing business
Adjacent uses	Agricultural fields to the east and north; residential plus Pattenden Lane industrial uses to the west; railway line and station to the south and residential. There are a further number of residential properties facing the site to the east of Maidstone Road and a further residential property (Hartridge) to the east of the site on the northern side of Maidstone Road.

Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Nil
Planning history	<p>98/0079 - Erection of a detached double garage with pitched roof was granted with conditions on 25/2/98.</p> <p>97/0075 - Prior notification of agricultural permitted development - irrigation reservoir . – APD Standard Approval Decision on 17/2/1997</p> <p>86/1314 - Erection of stock building for winter housing ewes was approved 21/10/1986.</p> <p>81/1157 - Details of siting, design, external appearance and means of access of agricultural dwelling pursuant to 78/496 was granted 20/8/81.</p> <p>81/0808 - Details of agricultural dwelling – was refused on 15/6/81.</p> <p>78/0496 - Agricultural Dwelling was granted on 12/10/78</p>
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>This is a substantial, level tract of cultivated land of exiting rural character. There are expansive, long distance views of the wider countryside, beyond the site boundaries, to the north, west and east from the footpaths which cross the site. The elevated land of the Greensand Ridge can be seen in the far distance in views north.</p> <p>Reciprocal views of the site are seen from the north looking south from the same footpaths.</p> <p>Leaving Marden heading north along Maidstone Road there is a clear change in character on crossing the railway line to large residential properties set back from the road and again beyond the property The Old Vicarage as the views open out towards and across the site to the west and the wider countryside to the north. The site is not differentiated in character from the wider countryside it adjoins to the north and east.</p> <p>The development of the site as proposed would cause significant harm to this open, rural character creating a substantial mass of development which is highly visible in mid range views from Maidstone Road and in both short and longer range views from the footpaths.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald</p>

	<p>Key characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of the Low Weald</li> <li>• Small fields with orchards, pasture, ponds and watercourses</li> <li>• enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost</li> <li>• Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed for intensive arable cultivation</li> <li>• Sparse scattered small woodlands</li> <li>• Winding roads with wide verges bounded by ditches and mixed native hedgerows</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden</li> </ul> <p>Condition: Good Sensitivity: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• Conserve the pastoral land and orchards and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads and hamlets</li> <li>• Resist further linear development and intrusive elements along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site is composed of a mixture of arable and intensively managed grassland fields. There are a few mature trees on the boundary of the NE field. There are some buildings in the SE corner of the site and there are two water bodies within the centre of the site with some rough grassland adjoining the</p>

	<p>water bodies. There is an area of ancient woodland adjoining the western boundary. The buildings may have some suitability for roosting bats. The water bodies and the rough grassland area may contain suitable habitat for protected/notable species.</p> <p>Ecology Constraint Level 4 - minimal potential for ecological impacts - No obvious habitats or features on or near site with potential for protected/notable species.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>Tree protection status: Whilst there are no TPOs covering the site there appear to be significant trees along the line of field boundaries.</p> <p>Ancient woodlands: There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p>Hedgerow status: There are potentially 'important' hedgerows along field boundaries.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Mostly grade 3 agricultural, some grade 2 in the SE corner of the site.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>Historic Buildings: Church Farm House and The Oast House are Grade II listed buildings situated directly opposite this site. Other former farmyard buildings have also been converted to residential use and these should be considered as non-designated heritage assets. These buildings taken together form a highly attractive farmstead group whose significance is considerably enhanced by their rural setting. This setting would be destroyed by development of this land.</p> <p>The Old Vicarage, also Grade II listed, shares its northern boundary with the site. This building currently enjoys a largely rural setting which would be impaired by development of the site.</p> <p>Conservation Areas: Marden Conservation Area lies to the south but impact on its setting would be minimised by the intervening feature of the railway line.</p> <p>Historic Parks and Gardens: None affected.</p> <p>Archaeology: The route of the PLUTO pipeline laid during the Second World War to provide fuel for allied troops in the invasion of France may cross this site.</p> <p>There are strong heritage objections to the development of this site.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	The site lies adjacent to historic farm complex of Church Farm. It also lies immediately north of historic pipeline, PLUTO.

	Scale 4 – Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval.
PROW (within or near site)	Footpath KM240 runs along the eastern boundary of the site. KM241 crosses the north east part of the site and eventually links to Underling Lane to the north. Footpath KM242 runs along the western boundary, linking Underling Lane and the northern platform of Marden station.
Access (Highways) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessed from the B2079 Maidstone Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys good access to the B2079 Maidstone Road, which has a good crash record. A continuous footway link to Marden village centre is provided on Maidstone Road to the south of the site, which would need to be extended to the site access.</li> <li>• The site is within walking and/or cycling distance of many of the village services within Marden, including the railway station, which is served by half-hourly train services to Ashford, Staplehurst, Paddock Wood, Tonbridge and London Charing Cross on weekdays.</li> <li>• The bus stops on Marden High Street are served by Bus Route 26, which provides a service to Maidstone, Yalding and Goudhurst every two hours on weekdays.</li> <li>• It is recommended that Network Rail be consulted on this site given the proximity of the Ashford-Tonbridge railway line.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>The site is not on an existing bus route. Marden is served by the 26/27 bus service which operates between Maidstone and Goudhurst.</p> <p>The south western corner of the site is immediately adjacent to Marden Railway Station.</p> <p>From the only existing access point into the site from Maidstone Road, the site is approximately 0.5km walking distance to the centre of the village (the junction of Maidstone Road and High Street) and 1km to the primary school.</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	The development would have an immediate amenity impact on the property Orchard View which is within the site area. The Old Vicarage lies to the south of the site
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	No known limitations. The promoter states that services can be accessed from B2079.
Air quality/noise	Not in AQMA or hot spot
Land contamination	None known
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Not in flood zone but flood zone 2 is only 0.15km away. No aquifers.

	<p>Surface runoff from all sites should be managed using sustainable drainage techniques, with discharge restricted to no more than runoff from the existing site following the critical rainfall events for a range of return periods, up to an including the 100yr event. An allowance for climate change should also be included the drainage design.</p> <p>Marden Drainage Strategy: We recommend a local drainage strategy be developed into which all the sites should contribute to, rather than each site considering site drainage independently. A local drainage strategy will likely result in a more efficient local drainage infrastructure.</p>
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>The development of this site would result in a substantial expansion, out of scale with the existing village. The railway line currently acts as a physical limit to the extent of the village to the north east. Beyond this point existing development is limited, being sparsely distributed along Maidstone Road. Development of the site would introduce an intensive form of development in a location which is physically removed from the existing built up area of the village. A development of this scale could also adversely impact on the setting of nearby listed properties. It would be subject to both short and longer range views from public footpaths. Opportunities for the sustainable connections to the village, needed for a development of this scale, are also limited by the presence of the railway line. Connections could currently only be achieved along Maidstone Road, which does not have pavements north of Highfield House and via the footbridge at Marden railway station.</p> <p>This site is considered unsuitable for development.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner No named developer.
Availability conclusion	Potentially available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	There do not appear be any abnormal constraints to prevent the site being developed. There are two irrigation reservoirs within the site. Existing farm buildings could be cleared and the site decontaminated as required.
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale

2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

The previous assessment concluded as follows

*'The indicated site capacity (500+ dwellings) would appear to be achievable on this 30.44ha site and there are no abnormal constraints applying to the site as far as can be ascertained and the landowner is willing to release the land although no developer has been identified.*

*However, development of this site would result in a substantial expansion of the settlement, out of scale with the existing village.*

*The railway line currently acts as a physical limit to the extent of the village to the north east. Beyond this point existing development is limited, being sparsely distributed along Maidstone Road.*

*Development of the site would introduce an intensive form of development in a location which is physically removed from the existing built area of the village. A development of this scale could also adversely impact on the setting of nearby listed properties.'*

The material circumstances and considerations relating to this site have not changed in the intervening period. The decision to reject the site previously is still sound.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-154
Site name/address	Broomfield Park, Kingswood.
Landowner	R Schroeder.
Agent	Eco-build Partnership UK.
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield primarily with some PDL.
Site area (ha)	40
Proposed yield	900 dwellings.
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural, a small part of the boundary is adjacent to Kingswood settlement boundary.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	This site was submitted as part of the call for sites exercise during the preparation of the 2009 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>This is a large site on the western edge of Kingswood village. The site is screened on the west, north and east sides by tree growth, although on the northern edge this is quite permeable.</p> <p>The site is comprised of separate parcels of land used for different purposes, although most of the site is used as a nursery for Christmas trees.</p> <p>The land is mostly flat but rises slightly to the north from Gravelly Bottom Road.</p>
Current use	A mixture of uses, Christmas tree nursery and sales, storage for cars and caravans, workshops, and a general dumping ground for non-specific waste items. Also woodland.
Adjacent uses	<p>South – residential.</p> <p>North – agricultural.</p> <p>East – Kingswood village.</p> <p>West – woodland.</p>
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Local wildlife sites located adjacent to the north west and to the north east.
Planning history	Various applications going back to 1970s, primarily concerned with storing caravans. Some applications related to replacement industrial workshops.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 31-2: Kingswood Ridgeline Woodlands</p> <p><u>Key characteristics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive tracts of mixed and sweet chestnut coppice woodland.</li> <li>• Plateau of Greensand Ridge and dip slope to east.</li> <li>• Deep loam to clay soils with extensive deposits of head.</li> <li>• Strong sense of enclosure.</li> <li>• Extensive recent development.</li> </ul>

	<p><u>Summary of analysis</u>  Condition assessment – good.  Sensitivity assessment – moderate.</p> <p><u>Guidelines</u>  Conserve and reinforce.</p> <p><u>Summary of actions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</li> <li>• Conserve and reinforce the woodland and woodland edge through continued management</li> <li>• Conserve the sense of enclosure and wooded character</li> </ul> <p>The land management aim is to protect and enhance the ancient woodland and ensure that the island semi-natural ancient woodland is connected to the surrounding woodland and not further isolated.</p>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>There are areas of ancient woodland within the site. And the site is adjacent to a LWS and ancient Woodland. Please note that although some of the areas designated as Ancient woodland are not currently wooded - the ground flora may still represent that of the ancient woodland. The rest of the site is a mixture of grassland, arable fields, hard standing, to the south of the site there are buildings and residential areas and 1 pond is within the site. Potential for protected/notable species present - including ancient woodland indicator species, reptiles, roosting bats and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>1/4, 1 is the most sensitive.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p>A large area, number 10 of 1996, in the eastern portion of the site.  A small area, number 32 of 2002, adjacent to the eastern boundary.  Very small area, number 28 of 1984, in the south west of the site.</p> <p>Eastern and northern sections of the site/adjacent to northern sections of the site are ancient woodland.</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>Eastern and southern sections of the site are grade 2.</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p>Historic parks and gardens survey recommended to clarify the significance of Kingsbroom historic garden and perhaps extend to historic landscape survey.</p>
<p>Archaeology (SAM etc.)</p>	<p>Land contains a possible extensive mesolithic and neolithic activity site, with flint artefacts. Further mesolithic and neolithic finds are recorded in surrounding area. There is a Romano-British or medieval bloomery a few metres north of north east boundary; a locally listed garden containing historic</p>

	<p>horticultural specimens lies adjacent to east boundary. Map evidence suggests this woodland has been highly utilised and compartmentalised from at least post medieval period if not earlier - evidence of woodland management may survive on site.</p> <p>3/5, 5 is the least sensitive.</p>
PROW (within or near site)	<p>Footpath KH302 runs along and through the northern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Footpath KH309 runs along the eastern boundary of the site.</p>
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site has been promoted for Housing, A1 and B1c land uses.</li> <li>• Potential for access from Gravelly Bottom Road and/or Broomfield Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for very limited A1 and/or B1c uses only at present. Gravelly Bottom Road and Broomfield Road suffer from poor forward visibility in places and the carriageway is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass without encroaching on to the highway verge. There are no footways present.</li> <li>• Gravelly Bottom Road and Broomfield Road would require significant upgrade work to address these matters, which would substantially alter their rural character. Consideration would also need to be given to the installation of measures to dissuade rat-running through unsuitable rural roads in the vicinity of the site and to manage traffic speeds. Enhanced public transport provision would also be required.</li> <li>• There are few services or public transport links within walking or cycling distance of the site.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Bus stop (Broomfield Road) – 430 metres.</p> <p>Railway station (Hollingbourne) – 6.5km.</p> <p>Shop – 900 metres.</p> <p>GP (Orchard Surgery, Langley) – 1.9km.</p> <p>School (Kingswood) – 760 metres.</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>Gravelly Bottom Road is in the main a low density residential road. Building 900 dwellings plus a mixture of commercial units – retail and employment, would undoubtedly change the character of the area and most likely the enjoyment of existing residents.</p> <p>The land, which is in private ownership, is not accessible for public use. Local residents would not be losing land as such and would have a new public realm in which to circulate. Amenity in this sense would improve, especially if the list of facilities were delivered as proposed.</p> <p>Transport access to the area is questionable. The developers propose that they could fund their version of the Leeds-Langley bypass with this development, plus an allocation at junction 8 of the M20. This is unlikely to be the case, so access to the</p>

	area would most likely be taken along existing roads that would need to be upgraded – further eroding the rural character.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Utilities already serve Kingswood village and the properties on Gravelly Bottom Road, so serving this site should not cause major issues. The site, however, is proposed for 900 dwellings, this means that there would have to be consideration of whether the existing services could deal with this or whether they would need to be upgraded.
Air quality/noise	No comments.
Land contamination	No comments.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Zone 1.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site in one ownership.</li> <li>• Screening to west, north and east.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illogical expansion of Kingswood.</li> <li>• Only a small part of the boundary is adjacent to the Kingswood settlement boundary.</li> <li>• Development relies on the construction of the Leeds-Langley bypass, along an alignment that has not been approved.</li> <li>• Rural character of area would be significantly altered.</li> <li>• Ecologically very sensitive.</li> <li>• Development is as large/larger than the existing Kingswood settlement.</li> <li>• Local services are limited.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>This development of this site is dependent on better road links to Kingswood from Maidstone/the wider area. It is suggested that the Leeds-Langley bypass could be provided as part of the development but the council could not fund this road with up to four times the amount of dwellings suggested for this development (previous strategic development area strategy).</p> <p>The proposed development is also of a scale that is equal to the existing Kingswood village. To promote such a development in this location would be questionable. Although the site is largely screened, this development would undeniably and inappropriately change the character of the area.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	A number of existing uses but land is all in one ownership with a willing landowner.  Interested developer is Eco-build Partnership UK.
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	The Leeds-Langley bypass is an essential component of the scheme, but would need to be delivered on an alignment not previously approved. This is unlikely to be viable from a 900 dwelling development, regardless of whether it is actually appropriate to start with.
Achievability conclusion	Unlikely to be achieved

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows</p> <p><i>'This site is rejected for the reasons listed in the suitability category. The proposed Eco village at this site is simply inappropriate to add on to a settlement the size of Kingswood.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed development is reliant on the delivery of a link road that has not been built despite years of effort on the parts of the County Council and the Borough Council.</i></p> <p><i>The combination of these factors alone means that this proposal would be unlikely to ever be delivered as outlined by the developers. However, the brief that the developers submitted also proposes the delivery of a cinema, a pub, a library, a medical centre, a new primary school, a new village hall and light industrial units. While it is unlikely that all of these facilities are required to sustain a village, even one that is proposed to expand to the size that the developers propose for Kingswood, the delivery of all of this community infrastructure is doubtful in viability terms.</i></p> <p><i>The combination of these factors means that this site is not allocated for housing.'</i></p> <p>There have been no changes in the material circumstances relating to the site since the previous assessment. Development on this site does not accord with the Council's preferred spatial strategy and there are serious concerns about deliverability and viability for the necessary infrastructure to serve the development. It is highly likely that it would not be deliverable within the timescale envisaged by the proposers.</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-155
Site name/address	New settlement at Otham
Landowner	Land is in several ownerships
Agent	Chris Blundell, Golding Homes
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	164.03
Proposed yield	4,500
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>This is a very large site which is removed from the urban periphery of Maidstone to the south east along the A274, Sutton Road, by approximately 1km. The site lies in very close proximity to the village of Otham (a Conservation Area) to the west and also encompasses land in Leeds and Langley parishes to the east/south east.</p> <p>The site encompasses land to the east of New Road, Otham and Otham Street, extending along Otham Street nearly as far as Caring Road to the North. The site's north eastern and eastern boundaries lie in close proximity to Caring Lane and the site crosses Back Street at Arnold Farm. To the south, the site extends as far as the A274, skirting the boundary with Rumwood Nursery on New Road and the buildings at Rumwood Green Farm on Sutton Road.</p> <p>The centre portion of the site is not included in the site submission. This section includes several detached residential properties and farm buildings along Holly Farm Road and part of Avery Lane near its junction with Holly Farm Road.</p> <p>There are a number of roads and tracks traversing the site, including Avery Lane in the centre of the site and Stoneacre Lane to the west, which has a Grade II* Listed Building (Stoneacre) abutting the site boundary in this area.</p> <p>The southernmost and central sections of the site, closest to the A274, Sutton Road, are relatively flat and consist of open fields, some of which are used as orchards, and for market gardening, including greenhouses. The remainder of the land in this location consists of open green fields with individual farm buildings and a number of residential properties, particularly along Holly Farm Road, Back Street and Avery Lane. Most of the fields in this area have high hedges and are adequately screened from</p>

	<p>the roads.</p> <p>To the west of the site's central area, there is a deep and picturesque valley separating Stoneacre Lane and Otham Street, the majority of which is in the Otham Conservation Area. When standing near the war memorial and playing field at the junction of Otham Lane and Stoneacre Lane, there are clear and uninterrupted views across the valley in the direction of Caring Lane.</p> <p>Similarly, there is a valley running west/east between the northern section of Otham Street and Caring Lane (near junction with Forge Lane). The section of the site near Arnold Court on Caring Lane is significantly higher than the parcel of land in close proximity to Stoneacre and the land in between can be described as undulating. There are clear views from the site boundary in the vicinity of Arnold Court towards the North Downs.</p>
Current use	<p>Site has a number of uses at present including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horticultural</li> <li>• Agriculture</li> <li>• Residential</li> </ul>
Adjacent uses	Predominantly horticultural and agricultural uses.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Site is in the open countryside and is therefore protected under Local Plan policy ENV28.
Planning history	No previous planning applications for the site as a whole
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012</p> <p>The site falls into an number of Landscape Character Areas</p> <p>The overall character area  <b>30: Langley Heath Undulating Farmlands</b></p> <p>Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale field pattern for orchard and soft fruit production</li> <li>• Grazed pasture</li> <li>• Species rich native hedgerows</li> <li>• Small mixed woodland blocks</li> <li>• River Len situated in shallow valley to the north</li> <li>• Numerous vernacular style buildings and use of local materials</li> <li>• Pockets of high density, recent development</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Very Good  Sensitivity Assessment: Very High  Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and enhance poplar shelterbelts and other vegetation which softens polytunnels and large agricultural barns</li> <li>• Avoid junction improvements which detract from the distinctive narrow country lanes</li> <li>• Conserve the small scale, historic, enclosed field pattern and areas of fruit production</li> </ul> <p>More detailed character areas</p> <p><b>30.4 Stoneacre Spring</b> Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steep valley sides</li> <li>• Small fields and gardens</li> <li>• Small copses and woodland within valley</li> <li>• Yew trees around residential buildings</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Very Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guidelines: Conserve</p> <p>Summary of Actions Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve the general linear settlement pattern</li> <li>• Conserve the rural and tranquil setting of Stoneacre</li> <li>• Conserve the pattern of small copses and woodland along the sharper contours of the valley</li> <li>• Conserve the frequency of yew trees, planting new yew trees where appropriate</li> <li>• Conserve the small scale field pattern</li> </ul> <p><b>30.8 Langley Fruit Plateau</b> Key Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale field pattern</li> <li>• Shelterbelts and tall hedgerows</li> <li>• Small farms and cottages throughout the area</li> <li>• Recent residential area at Langley Heath</li> <li>• Narrow roads</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: Moderate Guidelines: Conserve and Reinforce</p> <p>Summary of Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and reinforce the external boundaries of the larger irregular field areas</li> <li>• Conserve tall hedgerows, poplar shelterbelts and reinforce small copses</li> <li>• Conserve and respect the small scale settlement pattern</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	KCC Ecology states that there are areas of Ancient Woodland within and adjacent to the site. The majority of the site is arable fields, intensively managed orchards, and grassland fields. The middle

	<p>of the site is more interesting and is a mixture of traditional orchards, rough grassland, buildings and hard standing. The whole site is a mosaic of small fields/parcels of lands and they are all surrounded by mature hedgerows - The hedgerows provide good connectivity for wildlife throughout the whole site and adjacent area. Due to the size there is a need to consider the impact any development will have on designated sites. There are a number of ponds within the site and surrounding area. Potential for protected/notable species to be present including breeding birds, bats, reptiles, GCN and badgers.</p> <p><b>Ecological Constraint Level 1:</b> Potential for significant ecological impacts - Suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site. Site is on or near to designated area (including international, national, local sites and BAP habitat) with potential impact pathways.</p>
<p>Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)</p>	<p><b>Tree protection status:</b> Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 2 of 1982 protects individual trees and a group of trees at the northwest tip of the site.</p> <p>The west of the site adjoins Otham Conservation area and within this, at Pigeon Bank, is a woodland TPO, No. 39 of 1981.</p> <p>There are many other significant trees and woodlands within this site which would merit a TPO should it become expedient.</p> <p><b>Ancient woodlands</b> (<i>from 'a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone Borough, August 2012'</i>) There are three small woodlands within northwest portion of the site which are designated as ancient semi-natural woodland.</p> <p><b>Hedgerow status:</b> There are likely to be 'important' hedgerows.</p>
<p>Agricultural land quality</p>	<p>Site is Grade 2 agricultural land</p>
<p>Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)</p>	<p>There are several listed buildings within and adjacent to the site, most notably the Grade II* listed National Trust property Stoneacre and the Grade I listed Synyards.</p> <p>Part of the western boundary of the site also abuts Otham conservation area.</p> <p>Development would significantly impact on these heritage assets.</p>
<p>Archaeology (SAM etc.)</p>	<p>This is a large site which contains several heritage assets, especially post medieval agricultural</p>

	<p>buildings and historic landscape features. The area around Stoneacre Farm and Bramley are particularly sensitive being post medieval or earlier complexes and are locally registered parklands KCC has suggested that the site would benefit from a historic parks and gardens or landscape assessment prior to consideration of development. This is to help ensure that informed decisions are made at this early stage.</p>
<p>PROW (within or near site)</p>	<p>The site sits within a complex network of public footpaths and restricted byways, most of which traverse the site from west to east, connecting Otham to Leeds and other small clusters of development.</p> <p>Development would have to be designed around this existing network, or diversions would have to be put in place. The latter could affect the deliverability of the site due to the legal implications of diverting footpaths.</p> <p>There are several PROW across the entirety of the site, some of which originate or terminate in Langley, Leeds and Otham.</p>
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>The site is directly accessible from the A274, Sutton Road, via New Road to the south of the site. Otham Street and Otham Lane which run parallel to the site's western boundary link to the A20, Ashford Road, further to the north, as does Caring Lane further east, which links to Back Street on the site's eastern boundary.</p> <p>KCC Highways notes that...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a significant site located to the east of Otham and the west of Leeds.</li> <li>• Housing development on this scale would likely require the provision of a purpose-built, strategic link road between the A274 Sutton Road and the A20 Ashford Road, as the existing local highway network could not be enhanced to the required standard. KCC is concerned that such infrastructure could not be viably provided by the developer(s) in addition to the site's other infrastructure and service requirements.</li> <li>• The site is not considered suitable for housing at present. Although it enjoys relatively good access to the A274 Sutton Road and the A20 Ashford Road and the surrounding local highway network has a relatively good crash record, forward visibility on these rural lanes is poor in places and the carriageway is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass without encroaching on to the highway verge. There are also no footways present for much of their length.</li> <li>• If it were possible to overcome these constraints, consideration would also need to be given to the installation of measures to dissuade rat-running through the unsuitable rural roads surrounding</li> </ul>

	<p>the site and to manage traffic speeds. Significantly enhanced public transport provision would also be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are few services or public transport links within a reasonable and safe walking distance of the site.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Centre of site is approximately 1.5km-2km from services (e.g. GP, local shop, PO, employment)</li> <li>• Nearest rail station is in Bearsted, which is approximately 3km from the site</li> <li>• Nearest bus stops are in Otham village or along Sutton Road – approx 500m from centre of site – bus services to town centre are infrequent from this area</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	The existing area is characterised by small hamlets, villages and communities set in open countryside that is very rural in character. Development of this scale would substantially change the dynamics within the local community.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	There are existing residential properties along the site boundaries and in the centre of the site. However, in total, there are approximately 100 dwellings in this area. The proposed yield for this site is 4,500 dwellings, which would create a significant demand for utilities infrastructure and would need further investigation with the main service providers.
Air quality/noise	There are no current issues with air quality or noise in the site area. However, development on the scale proposed would impact negatively on air quality and noise pollution, and significant mitigation measures would be required. It is likely that development of this site would place increased pressure on existing hotspots, particularly at the Wheatsheaf junction and along the A20.
Land contamination	Agricultural and horticultural uses are ongoing on site. Some contamination would be expected as a result and mitigation measures would be required
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	The site is not in flood zone 2 or 3 and the EA have highlighted no specific issues with this site.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p>The development of this large site for 4500 new dwellings and associated development would fundamentally change the character of the rural hamlets to the south east of Maidstone. This change in character would result in considerable harm to the countryside and would spread the town of Maidstone considerably into the countryside. Furthermore, given the fact that the site is not immediately adjacent to the urban boundary it would result in an awkward gap of rural sporadic development between significant areas of development that would emphasise the harm to the character and pattern of the area.</p> <p>There are concerns raised by consultees in relation to impact on the highway network and air quality</p>

	with further work required on ecology, landscape and ancient woodland, noise, air quality, heritage, archaeology and utility infrastructure.
--	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	The land is in several different ownerships and the promoter notes that all land is available for development. However, the land in question surrounds several dwellings in the centre of the site which are currently unavailable and do not form part of the proposal.
Availability conclusion	The submission is made by Golding Homes on the basis that the land is available for development. However, there is no evidence put forward for example, written contracts or agreements from landowners or even an expression of interest from each landowner.  Therefore it is not possible to be certain in relation to the question of availability.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	The submission includes the provision of a purpose-built, strategic link road between the A274 Sutton Road and the A20 Ashford Road, as the existing local highway network could not be enhanced to the required standard.
Achievability conclusion	Kent Highways have raised concern that such infrastructure could not be viably provided by the developer(s) in addition to the site's other infrastructure and service requirements.  Given this concern and the lack of a submitted costing for the project that has been agreed with the local highway authority and expected delivery period there can be no certainty that the development of this site is achievable.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X
2016 - 2021	X
2021 - 2026	X
2026 - 2031	X

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows  <i>'The development of this large site for 4500 new dwellings and associated development would fundamentally change the character of the rural hamlets to the south east of Maidstone. This change in character would result in considerable harm to the countryside and would spread the town of Maidstone considerably into the countryside. Furthermore, given the fact that the site is not immediately adjacent to the urban boundary it would result in an awkward gap of rural sporadic development between significant areas of development that would emphasise the harm to the character and pattern of the area.'</i>	

*There are significant issues to be overcome in relation to highways, noise and air quality if development were to take place on this site. Some of the land is of high value, and there are likely to be significant ecological impacts. Throughout the site there are pockets of ancient woodland as well as a number of listed buildings and areas with archaeological potential which may be unacceptably impacted by any development.*

*The multiple land ownerships may ultimately affect deliverability of the site despite the assertions of the proposer.*

*There is concern raised by Kent Highways with regard to the level of investment required for the infrastructure in relation to both the development of the site and the strategic link road between the A274 Sutton Road and the A20 Ashford Road being prohibitive to the achievability of development. There has been no submissions that give a clear demonstration that the strategic road link is achievable to counter these concerns. The conclusions lead to questions in relation to the achievability of the development.*

*Furthermore, the site does not accord with the agreed spatial distribution it is recommended for rejection.'*

The key issue is whether there has been a significant material change in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment. It is considered that there has not been any such change and that the same conclusion should be reached.

REJECT

YIELD -0

**Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014** Unsustainable location as existing settlement has very few services.

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-159
Site name/address	BENSTED CLOSE, WEST STREET, HUNTON
Landowner	DWL Hubble
Agent	Godfrey H Chapples
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	2.2
Proposed yield	55 units
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local Plan rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site is part of an open field, generally very flat. It is bounded by fields to the northwest and north east, with a residential close to the south west. There is a Historic Park opposite the site.
Current use	Agricultural field
Adjacent uses	Residential and agricultural
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Countryside and Special Landscape Area
Planning history	<u>81/0221</u> Outline appn for residential development - REFUSED
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	No.
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>The site is very flat and open and there are clear long distance views, particularly from West Street to the north east. There is a residential close adjacent to the site, but site is not part of an existing pattern of development. Would harm the open, rural character of the Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>Landscape Character Area Assessment: KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low lying landscape which forms part of the Low Weald</li> <li>Reservoirs and water bodies along the foot of the Greensand Ridge</li> <li>Drains running southwards towards the River Beult</li> <li>Enclosed pasture</li> <li>Frequent orchards</li> <li>Parkland landscape surrounding Hunton Court</li> <li>Historic settlement of Yalding</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment Very Good Sensitivity Assessment High</p> <p>Guidelines Conserve</p> <p>Conserve orchards and the traditional small scale field pattern Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of existing development</p>

	<p>Conserve the historic parkland landscape around Hunton Park</p> <p>Conserve the rural setting of traditional buildings and farmhouses</p> <p>Conserve distinctive ragstone walling</p> <p>Conserve the undeveloped character of the landscape</p> <p>Resist conversion to arable land</p> <p>Avoid linear infill development along roads</p>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>None significant expected</p> <p>KCC Ecological Officer comments:          "Arable field with a hedgerow along the SW and SE boundary of the site. Limited potential to contain protected/notable species. Ecological constraints level 4. Some suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site."</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	None of significance.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>Conservation Officer comments:          "The Grade II listed lodge, gate piers and walls to Hunton Court lie directly opposite the site. Hunton Court itself (Grade II) and the Parish Church of St. Mary (Grade I) would also have their settings affected by development of this site, whose current open nature is an attractive feature of these settings. The character of Hunton as an estate village would be severely diluted if this site was developed.</p> <p>No registered parks or gardens are affected, but the parkland of Hunton Court, which is at least of local importance, lies directly opposite the site. Whilst built development does exist directly opposite the parkland further along West Street, this has an estate village character which complements the park."</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>KCC Archaeological Advisor comments:          "site lies close to medieval or earlier Church of St Mary and to Hunton Court, a later medieval country residence with an associated parkland, mainly post-medieval layout. An area with potential for prehistoric and later remains, especially Anglo-Saxon, on the basis of the early date for Hunton Church. Low level archaeology anticipated which could be dealt with through suitable conditions on a planning approval."</p> <p>Historic parks and gardens survey recommended to inform issues of setting of Hunton Park (locally listed parkland).</p>
PROW (within or near site)	None affected
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>KCC Highways comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties within Hunton.</li> <li>• Site accessed from West Street.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for housing. It enjoys relatively good access to the B2163 Heath Road via West Street and Hunton Hill, which have a good crash record. A continuous footway link to Hunton village centre is provided on West Street, which may need to be extended to</li> </ul>

	the site access. The 30mph speed limit may also need to be extended to the site access.”
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	KCC Highways comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “All of the village services within Hunton are within walking and cycling distance of the site and the nearby bus stops on West Street are served by Bus Route 26, which provides a service to Maidstone, Yalding and Goudhurst every two hours on weekdays.”</li> </ul>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	No significant issues
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Not expected
Air quality/noise	No
Land contamination	No significant adverse impacts envisaged, subject to detail.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	Likely achievable.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	Site is unsuitable due to being unsustainable and harm to open character of Special Landscape Area.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this time period
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<i>'Residential development would constitute a significant encroachment into the countryside and would harm the open and rural character of the Special Landscape Area. The site is very flat and open and there are clear long distance views, particularly from West Street to the north east. There is a residential close adjacent to the site, but site is not part of an</i>	

*existing pattern of development. Development would harm the open, rural character of the Special Landscape Area.*

*There would be some negative impact upon the setting of adjacent listed buildings and historic parkland, although the road does provide some separation.*

*Although, the site is within walking distance of facilities in Hunton village, these are very limited. Hunton is not a defined settlement and the site is not, therefore, considered well located in sustainability terms.*

*In terms of any mixed use development, as proposed in the submission, this is generally an unsustainable location, with limited access to facilities. Also, such a development would have a similar visual impact upon the openness of the countryside. Therefore, this type of development would not materially alter the suitability conclusions.'*

The material circumstances and considerations relating to this site have not changed since the previous assessment. Hence there is nothing to warrant a different conclusion being reached.

REJECT

YIELD -0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO-160
Site name/address	The Grange, George Street, Staplehurst
Landowner	Pickhill Development
Agent	D Bradley, Barton Willmore
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	4.2
Proposed yield	100 dwellings + some employment
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural – but adjacent to a site currently under consideration for a significant car park expansion – for the station.
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Re-submitted call for sites

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site is located to the north of Staplehurst. The site is currently surrounded by open countryside, although as set out above, the land to the south is proposed as a significant car park expansion – brought forward by a proposal for a new supermarket to the south of the railway line. There is some sporadic development to the north and to the east of the site. There is an existing property within the site.</p> <p>There are a number of trees within the site and significant hedge planting along the boundaries. There are four trees covered by a TPO that are located within the northern part of the site.</p> <p>There are ponds within the application site, and one to the north of the site. It is also noted that there are a significant number of water bodies within the land to the south of the site.</p> <p>The land is generally flat, although there is a slight rise from south to north and from west to east.</p>
Current use	Residential + undeveloped land
Adjacent uses	Residential and agricultural.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	N/A
Planning history	<p>MA/76/0390 - Residential development of eleven houses. Withdrawn.</p> <p>MA/81/0008 - Outline application for Elderly Persons Residence for 20 No. with staff accommodation. Withdrawn.</p>
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	N/A
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<p>Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 44: Staplehurst Low Weald</p> <p>KEY CHARACTERISTICS</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of the Low Weald.</li> <li>• Small fields with orchards, pasture, ponds and watercourses enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere.</li> <li>• Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost.</li> <li>• Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed for intensive arable cultivation.</li> <li>• Sparse scattered small woodlands.</li> <li>• Winding roads with wide verges bounded by ditches and mixed native hedgerows.</li> <li>• Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden.</li> </ul> <p>Condition Assessment: Good Sensitivity Assessment: High Guideline: Conserve.</p> <p>Summary of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald</li> <li>• Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards to replace aging populations</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted</li> <li>• the pastoral land use and orchards, and resist conversion to arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries</li> <li>• Conserve the landscape setting of historic settlements</li> <li>• Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads</li> <li>• Resist infill linear development along the A229</li> <li>• Soften the visual prominence of large agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments</li> <li>• Enhance habitat opportunities around water bodies and ditches by promoting and managing a framework of vegetation in these areas</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>The site consists of a number of small grassland fields with patches of scrub/rough grassland. To the NE of the site there is a small traditional orchard and there is a number of buildings at the south of the site. The site has a number of mature</p>

	hedgerows and trees. There are a number of ponds within the surrounding area. Potential for protected/notable species to be present including roosting bats, GCN and reptiles.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	TPO 16/1984 covers the oaks within the site.
Agricultural land quality	Grade 4.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	There are no listed buildings within the site or in close proximity of the site.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Contains former historic farm complex Moat Farm.
PROW (within or near site)	N/A
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>Site accessed from George Street.</p> <p>The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing. It enjoys good access to the A229 primary route via George Street, which has a good crash record, although it is likely that mitigation would be required at the A229 / George Street junction to provide improved visibility. Formal passing places and a footway would also be required along the stretch of George Street between the A229 and the site access.</p> <p>All of the village services within Staplehurst, including the railway station – which is served by half-hourly train services to Ashford, Paddock Wood, Tonbridge and London Charing Cross – are within walking and cycling distance of the site and the bus stops on Station Road and High Street are served by Bus Route 5, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst on weekdays.</p> <p>It is recommended that Network Rail be consulted on this site given the proximity of the Ashford-Tonbridge railway line.</p>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>The site is located within approximately 340metres of a site for an approved supermarket, and approximately 1.2km from the existing village centre.</p> <p>The railway station would be approximately 300m from the site (nearest point).</p> <p>The nearest bus stop would be approximately 400metres from the application site.</p> <p>The nearest health centre is located to the rear of the library which is approximately 1.2km from the site.</p> <p>The nearest primary school is approximately 1.4km metres from the site. There is no secondary school provision within the village.</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	<p>The site would be adjacent to a small number of existing residential properties, however, the impact upon these properties could be mitigated through a suitable design. Access could be made into the site within the need for an entry point that would significantly impact upon residential amenity. In terms of access to open space, the site would adjoin open fields, and would also be of a scale that would require the provision of internal play provision.</p>

Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	The site is not immediately adjacent to any significant level of housing provision. Access to key provisions is therefore unknown at this stage.
Air quality/noise	N/A
Land contamination	N/A
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	The site does not fall within a flood risk area. However, there are water bodies within. The site would be of a size where SUDs could be utilised.
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site is well screened from both the south and the east by a significant tree and hedge planting. Nonetheless, this site, to the north of the railway line appears as somewhat detached from the village itself, both in terms of permeability – the only point of access being the railway bridge, and also in terms of its character – appearing as very much rural in context.

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Yes The landowner is a development company
Availability conclusion	Available.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X Proposer has indicated this timescale
2016 – 2021	
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous assessment concluded as follows	
<p><i>'The site is separated from the village of Staplehurst by open countryside. The council are currently defending an appeal for development to the south (car park for the station) which is considered to cause visual harm. Further development to the north of this site would cause additional harm. The railway line is considered a defined barrier that the Council would not wish to see development to the north of.</i></p> <p><i>Links to the village are poor, and would rely on a single point of access across the railway bridge. This is not a particularly pleasant environment for those on foot.</i></p> <p><i>There is a substantial amount of tree coverage within the site which would be impact by the proposal. I therefore conclude that this is an unsustainable site, that is detached from the village centre. There would be significant visual harm should the site be developed. I</i></p>	

*therefore recommend that it be rejected.'*

There have been no changes in the material circumstances relating to the site since the previous assessment that would warrant a different conclusion being reached.

REJECT

YIELD - 0

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO2-173
Site name/address	Court Lodge Road Harrietsham
Landowner	
Agent	Alister Hume
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	4.3
Proposed yield	40
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Rural
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local Plan Rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site lies (in a Special Landscape Area) in the open countryside to the north of Harrietsham village, and abuts the existing village development boundary in a very small section of to the north east. The site is detached from the main built up area of the settlement and physically separated by the railway line to the south and a strong wooded boundary to the east, with a lake beyond. The site is adjacent to the North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty immediately to the west and north.</p> <p>Several residential dwellings (Court Lodge Cottages) look directly on to the site along its northern boundary, which is quite open apart from some intermittent hedges and trees. These dwellings are situated along Court Lodge Drive, which is accessed via Church Road to the west. Court Lodge Drive is a private lane leading to Court Lodge Farm.</p> <p>A public footpath which runs along the western perimeter of the site connects Court Lodge Drive to the railway station.</p> <p>The southern, eastern and western boundaries of the site are tree lined and form strong boundaries with the adjacent fields to the west, railway line to the south and pond to the east.</p>
Current use	Arable land
Adjacent uses	Residential, agricultural, transport (rail station close to boundary of site across rail line)
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Site is in the open countryside adjacent to AONB. Site is in a Special Landscape Area
Planning history	Rejected site (81) in previous SHLAA (2009). The site was rejected on the grounds that it is detached from the main built up area and physically separated by the railway to the south and a strong wooded boundary to the east, with a lake beyond...the site is a field in open countryside and any development here would have a detrimental effect on the adjacent AONB.

	<p>MA/13/2124: Outline application for the erection of 40 dwellings and associated works with garages/carports, public open space/play space, an estate road, access and pedestrian links with access to be considered and appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for future consideration: REFUSED 14/03/2014: <b>APPEAL LODGED</b></p> <p>The site is included within the draft Harrietsham Neighbourhood Plan</p>
<p>Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening</p>	<p>Several residential dwellings (Court Lodge Cottages) look directly on to the site along its northern boundary, which is quite open apart from some intermittent hedges and trees.</p> <p>Site is in Eyhorne Vale Landscape Character Area, the <b>key characteristics</b> of which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape to north of the railway line is situated within the Kent Downs AONB</li> <li>• Mixed woodland belts and blocks</li> <li>• Willow trees mark the location of drains and ditches</li> <li>• Narrow lanes which generally run against the contours south west to north east</li> <li>• Distinctive brick railway bridges</li> <li>• Major infrastructure routes along the south western periphery</li> </ul> <p><b>Condition Assessment</b> Good</p> <p><b>Sensitivity Assessment</b> High</p> <p><b>Guidelines</b> Conserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North of the railway line, the landscape is situated within the Kent Downs AONB. The Kent Downs AONB is a nationally important designation which offers a high level of development constraint</li> <li>• Conserve the traditional setting of listed buildings and soften the impact of recent farm buildings through native planting</li> <li>• Avoid infill development and expansion across the downland at Harrietsham and Hollingbourne</li> </ul>
<p>Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &amp; local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)</p>	<p>KCC Ecology state that: The site is adjacent to an area of ancient woodland on the eastern boundary. The site is an arable field which is surrounded by mature hedgerows along the southern and Western boundary. The site is also adjacent to the railway line which will increase connectivity to the site. There are a number of water bodies within 100 m of the site so consideration will need to be given to the presence</p>

	<p>of GCN. The boundaries have the highest potential of containing protected/notable species including bats, reptiles, GCN and breeding birds.</p> <p>The Ecological Constraint level is graded at 2:</p> <p><b>Potential for moderate ecological impacts</b></p> <p>Suitable habitats and features for protected/notable species present on or near site. Near to designated site (including international, national, local and BAP habitat) with potential impact pathways. Likely level of significance is lower than (1) due to factors such as location (e.g. in relation to protected species ranges) and the extent of adjacent natural/semi-natural habitats.</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p><b>Tree protection status:</b> Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 3 of 1964 protects a large area of trees immediately east of the site. There are also significant trees on the southern boundary adjacent to the railway together with a number on the northern boundary and adjacent to protected trees on the eastern edge.</p> <p><b>Ancient woodlands</b> (<i>from ' a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone borough, August 2012'</i>) There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p><b>Hedgerow status:</b> The hedgerow along the western boundary is potentially 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Land is classified as grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>Comments from MBC Conservation officer are as follows:</p> <p><b>Historic Buildings:</b> Development of this site would impact upon the secluded setting of two listed buildings – the former boathouse/ gazebo (Grade II*) and Lake Cottage.</p> <p><b>Conservation Areas:</b> None affected.</p> <p><b>Historic Parks and Gardens:</b> The two listed buildings lie within ornamental grounds laid out with ponds which were formerly associated with Stede Hill. These ponds and grounds are of at least 18<sup>th</sup> century date, although the ponds may conceivably have originated as medieval fishponds. Development of this site would adversely affect the setting of these ornamental grounds.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	No known issues
PROW (within or near site)	KH207A runs along the western perimeter of the site – connecting Stede Hill to the railway station
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> </ul>	<p><u>Comments from KCC Highways are as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site located adjacent to existing residential properties in Harrietsham.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site accessed from Court Lodge Road, which is a private, single carriageway lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of its relatively unsustainable location and the restricted nature of the surrounding local highway network. It enjoys relatively good access to the A20 Ashford Road via Church Road, which has a good crash record. However, there is no footway present for part of its length, which would need to be addressed. Court Lodge Road may also need to be widened to safely accommodate the traffic generated by the development.</li> <li>• Many of the village services within Harrietsham are within walking and/or cycling distance of the site, subject to the provision of formal pedestrian facilities, including the railway station, which is served by hourly train services to Ashford, Bearsted, Maidstone, Bromley South and London Victoria on weekdays. The bus stops on Ashford Road are served by Bus Route 10, which provides an hourly service to Ashford, Bearsted and Maidstone on weekdays.</li> <li>• It is recommended that Network Rail be consulted on this site given the proximity of the Ashford to Maidstone railway line.</li> </ul>
<p>Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school</p>	<p>The site is very close to the train station (approx 300m from centre of site), and if a safe crossing of the railway line was in place, a number of other services would be easily accessed and would fall within approx 750m (shop, PO, Pub). The medical centre and village Hall is close to the site (500m from centre of site)</p>
<p>Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)</p>	<p>Only the southern half of the site is proposed for development. However, views from Court Lodge Drive would be compromised and structural landscaping would be required to minimise impacts.</p>
<p>Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric</p>	<p>There are existing residential dwellings in close proximity to site. Further connections should not be a problem.</p>
<p>Air quality/noise</p>	<p>Site lies adjacent to Ashford-Maidstone railway line. Mitigation measures will be required.</p>
<p>Land contamination</p>	<p>No known issues</p>
<p>Flood Risk (zone/drainage)</p>	<p>No known issues</p>
<p>Suitability (assessment conclusion)</p>	<p>The site is detached from the main built up area of Harrietsham and physically separated by the railway to the south and a strong wooded boundary to the east, with a lake beyond. The site is located within the open countryside assessed by the LCA as good condition and high sensitivity. Any development here would have a detrimental effect on the adjacent AONB.</p>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whole site is available</li> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>No existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>
Availability conclusion	Site is available.

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	No known issues
Achievability conclusion	Site is achievable.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now – 2016	X
2016 – 2021	X
2021 – 2026	
2026 – 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>The previous assessment concluded as follows:</p> <p><i>'Whilst this site is close to the village of Harrietsham and the services it provides, it lies within the open countryside and is somewhat disjointed from the existing built up area. Development of this site would have a detrimental effect on the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.'</i></p> <p>The circumstances of the site have not changed since the previous assessment and submission and the site continues to be unacceptable.</p> <p>REJECT</p> <p>YIELD - 0</p>

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO2-175
Site name/address	Green Lane, Langley
Landowner	Not Known
Agent	Peter Court
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.6 for development (part of larger site 6.4ha)
Proposed yield	Not known
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Adjacent to settlement
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Local plan rep

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	The site is part of a larger site currently utilised as a nursery for trees, which are then sold on in garden centres. There a number of trees (some significant) and hedgerows to the boundaries of the site.
Current use	Nursery for the growing of trees for onward sale at garden centres
Adjacent uses	North: Residential properties within the settlement of Langley Heath; East: Some residential and open countryside; South: A few residential dwellings on Green Lane, then open countryside; West: The remainder of the larger site (i.e. tree nursery).
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	Southern anti-coalescence belt
Planning history	79/0442 Residential development REFUSED
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	A larger site was submitted as part of the call for sites for the 2009 SHLAA.  It was rejected for the following reasons: <i>"Development in the location would constitute a substantial extension, out of scale with the existing settlement. The site relates poorly to the village. The Highway Authority's view is that Green Lane, on to which the site would access, is of poor standard."</i>
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	Landscape Character Assessment 2012 Landscape Character Area 30-8: Langley Fruit Plateau  KEY CHARACTERISTICS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale field pattern for orchard and soft fruit production</li> <li>• Grazed pasture</li> <li>• Species rich native hedgerows</li> <li>• Small mixed woodland blocks</li> <li>• River Len situated in shallow valley to the north</li> <li>• Numerous vernacular style buildings and use of local materials</li> <li>• Pockets of high density, recent development.</li> </ul> Condition Assessment: Very Good

	<p>Sensitivity Assessment: Very High Guidelines: CONSERVE AND REINFORCE</p> <p>Summary of actions Consider the generic guidelines for Greensand Orchards and Mixed Farmlands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and enhance the species rich hedgerows</li> <li>• Conserve the small scale, historic, enclosed field pattern and areas of fruit production</li> <li>• Conserve the remote qualities of the Len Valley and its setting, and strengthen vegetation along the River Len and adjoining ditches to improve habitat connectivity</li> <li>• Conserve the traditional, rural setting of vernacular style buildings and Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Resist further conversion to intensive arable land</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance poplar shelterbelts and other vegetation which softens polytunnels and large agricultural barns</li> <li>• Avoid junction improvements which detract from the distinctive narrow country lanes.</li> </ul>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	This site was arable in 2008, but the 2012 aerial photos suggest it has been intensively planted with trees. There is a hedgerow along the north, south west corner and eastern boundary. Site may have some potential for protected/notable species – but it will depend on what is growing within the site.
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p>Whilst there are currently no TPOs covering the site there are a number of significant boundary trees.</p> <p>There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p>There may be 'important' hedgerows on site boundaries.</p>
Agricultural land quality	Grade 2
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	Two listed buildings, Ye Olde Cottage and The Old Farmhouse, lie a short way to the south of this site but are separated from it by a small area of residentially developed land. Development of this site would have only a low/medium adverse impact on the setting of these listed buildings.
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	Not within a Safeguarded Area of Archaeological Potential
PROW (within or near site)	Footpath KH364 runs to the north of the site.
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p>KCC Highways Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site situated adjacent to existing residential properties in Langley Heath.</li> <li>• Site accessed from Green Lane.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of its relatively unsustainable location and the restricted nature of the local highway network. It enjoys good access to the A274 Sutton Road via Horseshoes Lane, Heath Road and Green Lane, which have a relatively good crash record and adequate forward visibility. However, Green Lane is a single carriageway road with few passing places and there are no formal footways present.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are few services within walking or cycling distance of the site; however the nearby bus stops on Heath Road are served by Bus Route 12, which provides an hourly service to Maidstone, Headcorn and Tenterden on weekdays.</li> </ul>
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>Site is adjacent to the settlement of Langley Heath which has a doctors' surgery, recreation ground/play area and a village hall.</p> <p>There are few other services within walking or cycling distance of the site, but the site is in walking distance of public transport (bus stops).</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	There are dwellings to the north and south of the site. An appropriate layout for any development should ensure that the amenity of the occupiers of those dwellings is respected.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	Existing neighbouring development. Provision unlikely to be a problem
Air quality/noise	Not in AQMA Noise unlikely be an issue
Land contamination	<p>There is the potential for highway issues for existing residents as access would be taken from the single width Green Lane.</p> <p>There would also be added pressure on services such as the doctors' surgery, village hall and recreation ground.</p>
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p>Small area towards northern boundary indicated to be in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>EA Comments: <u>Boughton Monchelsea Drainage Strategy</u> The area between Cliff Hill and Beresfords Hill of Boughton Monchelsea (NGR TQ773517) is at risk of flooding. The flooding mechanism of this area is complex and believed to be a combination of fluvial and groundwater flooding. Particular attention must therefore be given to means of surface water disposal from any new development upstream from Boughton Monchelsea, especially if infiltration of surface water drainage is being considered. This is because the structure of the underlying geology could allow rapid infiltration from a developed area to discharge to the watercourse to the south more rapidly than the natural greenfield rate, thereby increasing flood risk to existing properties.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reservoir at Brishing Lane is maintained and operated by the Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council for flood alleviation purposes. Significant expenditure is likely to be required in order to raise the standard of reservoir safety of this structure. We recommend the local authority consult the Parish Council and seek a financial contribution from all potential developers in this catchment to secure funding for essential long term maintenance and improvements to this structure.</p>

Suitability (assessment conclusion)	The site relates poorly to the village. The Highway Authority's view is that Green Lane, on to which the site would access, is of poor standard.
-------------------------------------	--

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing uses</li> <li>• Willing landowner</li> <li>• Willing developer</li> <li>• Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Land is in use as a nursery growing trees for future sale at garden centres.  There is a willing landowner.
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	There do not appear to be any abnormal costs or constraints identified with this site.
Achievability conclusion	Yes.

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X Proposer has previously indicated this timescale
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	
The previous submission concluded as follows	
<i>'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 as limited services. The site's development also has the potential to have an adverse highway impact. It is recommended that this site is rejected.'</i>	
The circumstances of this site have not changed since the previous assessment. Development on this site would not accord with the proposed settlement hierarchy.	
REJECT	
YIELD - 0	

## Housing Sites Assessment Proforma - 2014

<b>1. SITE INFORMATION</b>	
Reference number	HO2-178
Site name/address	NEW CUT ROAD AND BEARSTED ROAD, MAIDSTONE
Landowner	Not Known
Agent	Peter Court Associates
Greenfield/PDL	Greenfield
Site area (ha)	0.56
Proposed yield	Not known at this point
Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural	Edge of urban boundary
Site origin (call for sites/local plan rep?)	Call for sites (RE-SUBMISSION)

<b>2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY</b>	
Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)	<p>The site comprises a corner plot at the junction of New Cut Road and Ware Street. This junction has seen some extensive works within recent months providing access for KIMS located opposite and the proposed site lies adjacent to this new roundabout. The site is reasonably open in character and is set on a lower level than the road by approximately 1m/1.5m and currently dense rough grassland. This grassland extends to the boundaries with the highway. The site also has a stream which runs along its eastern and southern boundary linking to Vinters Park in the west. As a result together with the low level of this land, the land appears to be boggy in places particularly during winter months. Also bordering the eastern and southern boundaries is a densely planted area of woodland linking to that extending along Ware Street itself.</p> <p>The site is on the edge but within the urban boundary and within an area allocated for public open space under policy ENV24 of the MBWLP 2000.</p> <p>The site is in a prominent location and due to its open character, is significantly visible from both New Cut Road, Ware Street and Bearsted Road.</p>
Current use	Rough grassland – Allocated open space
Adjacent uses	To the south of the site is the Grove Green residential area. Immediately adjacent to the site to the west is an area of grassland and woodland. A number of retail uses as well as the KIMS site exist close by to the northern side of the Bearsted Road.
Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)	<p>The site is within the Strategic Gap, lies opposite the SLA and AONB of the downs.</p> <p>To the west of the site is an area of Local Landscape Importance comprising Vinters Park.</p> <p>The site is designated as Public Open Space in the MBWLP 2000.</p>
Planning history	Some historic planning history. Most recent and appropriate is MA/98/0872 granting consent for the

	use of land as an area of open space.
Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation	The site was assessed as part of the MBWLP 2000 and as part of the previous SHLAA in 2009
Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site falls within character area 14-1 – Weaving Fringes</li> <li>2. Key Characteristics (blue box) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large buildings and building complexes</li> <li>• Blocks of mixed and coppiced woodland</li> <li>• Busy roads</li> <li>• Pasture</li> <li>• Shelterbelts and clumps of woodland</li> <li>• Low lying ground with a series of small ponds to the north east</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. From Summary of Analysis Box <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condition Assessment = Moderate</li> <li>• Sensitivity Assessment = Low</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Guideline = Improve and Reinforce <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the generic guidelines for Gault Clay Vale</li> <li>• Improve and reinforce the more distinctive and characteristic elements, e.g. ancient woodland, streams, traditional buildings and open landscape at Newnham Court Farm, which strengthen the setting of the Kent Downs AONB</li> <li>• Avoid significant encroachment of the urban edge where it would detract from the open foreground to the Kent Downs AONB</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)	<p>The site has some ecological value.</p> <p><b>KCC Ecology Response –</b></p> <p>The site contains areas of Ancient Woodland and is adjacent to a LNR. It is an area of rough grassland and woodland and there is a stream/ditch running between the rough grassland/woodland area. There is good connectivity to the surrounding area increasing the potential of protected/notable species to be present including reptiles, bats and water vole</p> <p>.</p> <p>(Level 1)</p>
Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)	<p><b>Landscape officer Response –</b></p> <p><b>Tree protection status:</b></p> <p>Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 16 of 2011 protects one Ash tree on the boundary near the roundabout. The trees adjacent to the watercourse</p>

	<p>and at the back of the slope to east of the site make a significant contribution to the amenity of the area.</p> <p><b>Ancient woodlands</b> (<i>from ' a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone borough, August 2012'</i>) There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.</p> <p><b>Hedgerow status:</b> There are no 'important' hedgerows.</p>
Agricultural land quality	It appears that the land is of an agricultural land quality grading of 2.
Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)	<p>There are no listed buildings or conservations areas within or in close proximity of the site. Therefore, any development at this site is unlikely to have any significant heritage impact.</p> <p>No comments received from Conservation Officer.</p>
Archaeology (SAM etc.)	<p>The site is undeveloped and is not highlighted as being within an area of archaeological potential.</p> <p><b>KCC Archaeology Response –</b></p> <p>Iron age and medieval to north – Level 4</p>
PROW (within or near site)	There are two footpaths to the west of the site from which views of the site are possible. – KM46 and KM47
<p>Access (Highways)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site access</li> <li>• Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>• Access to strategic/main highway network</li> <li>• Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul>	<p><b>KCC Highways Response –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for access from New Cut Road and/or Bearsted Road, although KCC's preference would be for the primary vehicular access to be taken from Bearsted Road given the high peak period traffic flows present on New Cut Road.</li> <li>• The site is considered suitable for a limited quantum of housing in view of its location adjacent to a heavily trafficked roundabout junction. It enjoys good access to the to the A249 Sittingbourne Road, A20 Ashford Road and M20 Junction 7 via New Cut Road, which has a relatively good crash record, although there are no footways present in close proximity to the site, which should be addressed.</li> <li>• All of the local services within Grove Green are within walking and cycling distance of the site, subject to the extension of the footway on New Cut Road to the site access and the provision of appropriate crossing facilities. The nearby bus stops on Bearsted Road are also within walking distance of the site and are served by Bus Routes 333 and 334, which provide a combined half-hourly service to Maidstone and Sittingbourne, with onward connections to Faversham and</li> </ul>

	Sheerness respectively.
Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school	<p>There is a bus service within Grove Green 370m to the south of the site. There is also a bus stop on Bearsted Road 400m to the west.</p> <p>Bearsted Rail station is located 1.5 miles to the west.</p> <p>Local shops are provided within the locality with the Newnham Court area and a large supermarket both close by within walking distance.</p> <p>Local Schools and GP services are both provided in Bearsted and lies some 1.7 miles to the south west.</p>
Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space)	There are no residential properties within close proximity of the site. There would therefore not be any significant amenity issues.
Availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric	There are no existing facilities within the site, although due to its urban boundary location facilities exist nearby and could be provided within the site.
Air quality/noise	The site is on the boundary of the AQMA and is adjacent to a busy road forming a major route around the town. Therefore, there may be issues regarding air quality and noise at this site.
Land contamination	The site is not within a landfill area and so there are unlikely to be contaminated land issues.
Flood Risk (zone/drainage)	<p>Site is not detailed as being within a flood zone, although due to its low level and proximity to a stream, the site is liable for possible flooding.</p> <p>EA – No comments made</p>
Suitability (assessment conclusion)	<p><u>For</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within a sustainable location.</li> <li>• Good access to highway network and surrounding services.</li> </ul> <p><u>Against</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear development proposal.</li> <li>• Poor housing yield.</li> <li>• Site would see the loss of some significant established grassland with ecological potential.</li> <li>• Difficulties in developing the site due to the lower land level, the existing stream running along boundaries and established trees.</li> <li>• Site forms part of landscaped boundary fronting this area setting the boundary to the urban area and the change in development. Development would alter this character.</li> </ul>

<b>3. AVAILABILITY</b>	
Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No existing uses</li> <li>Willing landowner</li> <li>Willing developer</li> <li>Existing tenancy or lease agreement</li> </ul>	Willing landowner who has now submitted an outline planning application (14/502252/OUT) for 8 dwellings with access to be determined.
Availability conclusion	Available

<b>4. ACHIEVABILITY</b>	
Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered	None immediately apparent
Achievability conclusion	Potentially achievable

<b>Timing</b> (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?)	
now - 2016	X
2016 - 2021	
2021 - 2026	
2026 - 2031	

<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>
<p>There is currently an application lodged with the Council (14/502252/OUT) for 8 dwellings with access to be determined all other matters reserved.</p> <p>Overall conclusions on previous assessment:  <i>'The site would see the loss of some significant established grassland with ecological potential.  There are likely to be difficulties in developing the site due to the lower land level, the existing stream running along boundaries and established trees which may also lead to flooding issues.  The site forms part of landscaped boundary fronting this area setting the boundary to the urban area and the change in development.  Development would alter this character.'</i></p> <p>There has been any change in circumstances since the original SHLAA submission in 2013, despite the further information submitted.</p> <p>The site would also result in the loss of an area of designated open space under policy ENV24 of the MBWLP 2000.</p> <p>The site should therefore be rejected.</p> <p>REJECT YIELD -0</p>