



Gladman Developments Ltd

Maidstone Borough Local Plan Examination

Session 5A - Housing Supply

Qn5.3 Is the proposed 990 dwelling yield for H2(1) (Town Centre) adequately justified?

- 1 Gladman do not consider that the proposed 990 dwelling yield from town centre sites is adequately justified, in fact Gladman have concern over the deliverability of the 700 units as outlined in the originally submitted plan.
- 2 Having reviewed the number of applications received by the Council Gladman have found that there have been a total of 8 applications submitted within the defined town centre of Maidstone and a further 10 within the wider district outside of the town centre. Of this 8 only one shows any obvious sign of a consent being implemented, at Bishops Terrace for 44 units. The other applications total some 204 dwellings, whilst in theory these figures appear relatively strong, it is important to consider the deliverability of such sites, and whether, in reality the conversion of a number of the properties in question is actually practical and deliverable.
- 3 A number of the conversions relate to office stock of 30-40 years plus in age, converting such premises into residential is not be a straightforward task. Indeed in other locations, we note recent experience in Tunbridge Wells, some recent applications to convert such buildings have actually been unimplementable due to the design of the buildings, the cost of conversion and the suitability of the interior floor plates. This has led, in Tunbridge Wells, to consideration as to whether conversion is practical or whether wholesale demolition and rebuild is required.
- 4 Given the relatively low cost, and the considerably reduced need to produce new evidence to support an application, it is not surprising that a raft of applications have been received. However, Gladman would contend that there is little evidence to demonstrate that such applications will be delivered in the quantum to which the Council is seeking to rely on. A

number of the proposed conversions do indeed still appear to be in/or being marketed for business use.

- 5 Whilst Gladman therefore understand the suitability of city centre residential development we remain concerned about the scale of development relied upon by the Council to meet its overall plan targets. Gladman would contend that such developments ought to be factored into a calculation on windfall, based on evidence of the conversion and delivery of such units in Maidstone over a period of time. At present there is not sufficient evidence to justify the 990 units proposed.

Qn5.4 What should happen were the MoD not to make Invicta Park Barracks surplus to requirements?

- 6 The Council would need to allocate additional sites to plug the gap in the missing residential capacity within the plan period. A number of sustainable 'omission' sites are before the Council for consideration. Gladman also consider that the flawed SHEDLAA assessment of sites should be reconsidered along with a new call for sites to landowners. Sites within the existing SHEDLAA for example could be reconsidered to see if part of them could be brought forward for development. Gladman have already demonstrated the benefit of undertaking such a process through the submission and approval of an application for 62 units at Mill Bank, Headcorn and through the pending application at Maidstone Road, Marden for up to 150 units.

Qn5.5 Is it realistic to expect HS(L3) Lenham Broad allocation for 1,500 dwellings to be delivered within a 5 year period?

- 7 Gladman have significant concerns about the likelihood of any development delivering such numbers, in a relatively small settlement in such a narrow period of time. However, to fully understand the implications for delivery in that scale it would be necessary for the Council to investigate how many outlets are proposing to operate from the site at any one time. Gladman have found that to achieve the delivery rates required in delivering 1,500 units in 5 years there would be requirement for the coordinated delivery of 6 or more different house builders. Given the location of the site, this seems an unreasonable assumption.

Qn5.6 Is the Council's revised windfall allowance justified?

- 8 Gladman support the Council in removing sites from the first 3 years of the plan period to reflect planning consents, however we believe that there are further issues which need to be considered with regard to windfalls. Firstly, the link between windfalls on small sites and office based allowances for the town centres needs to be considered, whilst there may only be the potential for a small overlap in small sites for the whole plan period, and larger sites for the later part of the plan period, the Council must be clear and sure that it will not end up double

counting such development. Secondly whilst the issue of diminishing returns of land supply are acknowledged by the Council within paragraph 3.19 of SUB 005, Gladman consider that such issues, when considered in the context of the proposals within the plan, an allowance for office change of use for example, do not fully consider the implications of such an issue.

Qn5.8 Is the 5% allowance for non-implementation reasonable?

- 9 Gladman are supportive of the introduction of a non-implementation rate, it is not reasonable to expect 100% of all achieved consents to be delivered for a variety of site specific reasons. However, the 5% figure should be increased to a figure of at least 10%, this will not only help ensure deliverability, but importantly help provide flexibility and choice in the delivery of new homes.
- 10 A presentation given by DCLG Planning Director (Ruth Stanier) to the HBF Planning Conference in September 2015¹ highlighted the issue of planning permissions not materialising to a start on site, it estimated that 10%-20% of permissions do not in the end deliver housing. As DCLG termed it, these permissions simply 'drop out' for a number of potential factors such as landowner not achieving the price they need or want, a developer being unable to secure finance or meet the terms of a site option, the development is later not considered to be financially worthwhile or there are supply chain constraints hindering a start. Gladman are therefore of the view that the lapse rate applied should be a minimum of 10%.

Qn5.9 Is there a need for reserve allocations in case anticipated supply is not forthcoming and if so: a) How many reserve sites are needed b) Should such sites be allocated now or in a review of the Local Plan? c) How would sites be selected? d) What would trigger their release?

- 11 Gladman believe that there is a significant deficiency in terms of the 5 year land supply and the overall housing provision for the plan as a whole. On that basis the Council will need to find a range of sites to meet these needs, in accordance with the spatial strategy of the submitted plan. Whilst this is a task of some difficulty it is not an impossible task, the Warwick EIP is due to resume in September after a pause for some 12 months whilst the Council completed further work on the unmet needs emanating from the housing market area, further work on the green belt and whilst additional sites were identified. In the case of Maidstone much of the issues which caused that plan to be suspended for 12 months are not present, it is therefore

¹ <http://www.house-builder.co.uk/documents/Plan15-RuthStanier.pdf> Retrieved 07/09/16

considered that additional sites could be identified by the Council in a much shorter period of time, were the examination to be suspended to allow for that work to be undertaken.

- 12 As we advocate above Gladman do not believe that allowing pressing issues within a Local Plan to be the subject of a review is the correct or sound approach to tackling them. We have highlighted how there may be a need for a review to identify additional sites from unmet needs from surrounding districts, but a deficiency in sites to meet the housing needs of this plan can be identified now. A Local Plan review, even if commenced immediately would be a process which would take considerable additional time. Evidence of a number of Local Plans where such reviews have been promised have shown that even when an Inspector has set stringent deadlines for review they have been missed by local authorities. A prominent example would be Wiltshire. Gladman therefore believe these issues can be dealt with now, as part of this examination, all be it with a short pause for further work to be undertaken.
- 13 Sites should firstly be identified by the reconsideration of the SHEDLAA, Gladman have repeatedly expressed concerns with the robustness of this document and how it assesses land parcels within Maidstone. A call for sites accompanied by a review of this document, and the land within it, to see if elements of large parcels may actually constitute sustainable development would almost certainly increase the Council's deliverable supply of housing land.
- 14 Gladman consider that there already exists a deficiency of deliverable land in the plan as submitted, therefore any additional sites should be delivered as and when they are ready to come forward. Should the Inspector wish to consider the use of reserve sites any trigger for their release will need to be carefully worded, if the indication is that they are to come forward to remedy housing land supply issues, the policy for release needs to be triggered quickly, and related to the deficiency in supply. However, if a site is accepted as a reserve site by virtue of it being sustainable and deliverable, in accordance with the NPPF, it is difficult to see how it could or indeed should be precluded in delivering housing earlier, given what the NPPF states in terms of housing delivery, the need for housing in Maidstone and the wider South East and the pressing issue of affordability. The delivery of sustainable housing development is not a tap to be turned off once 5 years of housing land has been found.
- 15 What is also apparent is that even with the additional supply added to the overall housing target through the approval of submitted planning applications since the submission of the plan, which is to the Councils credit, it is still only providing for a total housing supply, according to SUB 005, of 19,235, a surplus of just 765 units (less than that would be lost if any 1 of the 3 contested Invicta Barracks, town centre office conversions or strategic area of growth in Lenham failed to deliver) which represents just a 4% surplus. These issues have been discussed

in the recent Stratford-on-Avon examination², the findings in the Inspectors report into the Core Strategy, published in June 2016 stated in paragraph 71, that in order to ensure the plan is positively prepared in line with the NPPF the 10% reserve for housing sites should be increased to 20%. Similarly the emerging plan for Redcar and Cleveland, published in May 2016, at policy H1 also considers a buffer of an additional 20% of housing land on top of requirement to be needed in order to:-

***“..promote a continuous supply of housing land in line with national policy,
and to reduce the risk of under-delivery...”***

- 16 It is therefore apparent that to provide a buffer of just 4% leaves the Council in a perilous position, and in potential risk of the plan failing to deliver its overall housing numbers.

Qn5.10 Is the Council's 5 years supply calculation accepted or disputed and, if so, why?

- 17 Gladman dispute the 5 year land supply put forward by the Council, it is considered that even with the updated figures put forward by the Council in the SUB 005 document the Local Plan falls considerably short of the level of housing needed to demonstrate a 5 year land supply. Even if all the assumptions put forward by the Council and its assessment of site delivery were accepted the margin for demonstrating a 5 year housing land supply is small, with a surplus of just 155 dwellings.
- 18 For the purposes of this exercise Gladman have used the housing requirement put forward by the Council, as we have stated in our other statements, and particularly as stated by Barton Willmore on behalf of Gladman in our matter 2A statement we consider that this figure does not constitute the FOAN for Maidstone. Nevertheless to identify the weakness of supply we have used the Councils own figure for the calculation. Gladman also concur with the Council that it should be dealing with undersupply as quickly as possible and that the buffer should be added to both the requirement and the backlog.
- 19 In terms of the buffer and to considerations as to whether or not Maidstone has persistently under delivered housing we note that the Council maintain that it should apply a 5% buffer and that it has not persistently under delivered. Gladman contend this point. The Council rely on the point that for the first 2 years of the plan period the housing requirement was being judged against the requirement as outlined in the RSS, a figure of 554 units not the 928 advocated as the FOAN for Maidstone. It is apparent that whatever figure is used there has been a significant under delivery of housing in the plan period from 2011/12 to 2015/16. The under delivery against FOAN has been 1,780 units nearly 2 years supply, whilst against the mix of FOAN and RSS targets it still sits at 1,032 units, in excess of 1 years supply. There has therefore been at

²<https://www.stratford.gov.uk/files/seealsodocs/171974/Inspectors%20Final%20Report%20-%20June%202016.pdf> Retrieved 09/09/16

least 3 consecutive years of substantial under delivery, and 5 consecutive years of substantial under delivery against the FOAN. Gladman believe therefore that there is a strong argument that Maidstone has persistently under delivered, and that a very substantial deficit for the plan period has already accrued, in order to give the Council the best way of catching up this deficit and meeting its housing needs a 20% buffer should be applied.

- 20 The main area of disagreement with the Council comes from the assessment of delivery rates and lead in times for the granted planning permissions and the proposed allocations within the Local Plan. It is acknowledged that the Council has attempted to make contact with landowners and developers to establish the delivery rates and lead in time associated with a number of the sites which make up the supply, as outlined in paragraph 4.2 of SUB 005. However, whilst this is a valuable starting point to assessing delivery these assumptions ought to be published and open to review both by respondents to the plan and the Council itself, in this regard we note the findings of the Local Plan Expert Group³, it states:

‘significant debate over supply revolves around the assumed lead in time and build rates of larger sites. This is complicated by the fact that LPAs tend to use assumptions provided to them by the developers of the site, as the PPG suggests. However, this information can satisfy the best interests of the developer and is not always realistic, and the PPG should confirm that evidence on likely timescale drawn from experience on comparable sites may be highly relevant.’

- 21 Gladman, have therefore undertaken an analysis below of what is considered a reasonable assessment of the delivery of sites, this has led to Gladman discounting 662 units from the 5 year land supply for current commitments and 728 units from the 5 year land supply from the proposed Local Plan allocations. These are detailed in the table submitted as Appendix 1 to this statement. We note that our deduction of sites with planning permission has included an analysis of sites with a capacity of over 100 units, and a deduction of 10% as a lapse rate. The rate has only been applied to those sites who’s trajectories have not been altered within Appendix 1. We would note that there are question marks over the potential duplication between planning permissions and allocations on sites H1(6), H1(11) and H1(10), there is

³ LPEG – Appendix 13 - <http://lpeg.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Appendices-local-plans-report-to-government.pdf> retrieved 07/09/16

therefore potential for further need to change the picture, we would request that the Council clarify the position with regard to these sites.

22 Gladman would suggest that it may be useful for the Council to publish a note to accompany the 5 year land supply calculation outlining the following data in relation to the larger sites with the higher delivery rates:

- a. Time factored in for determination of planning application;
- b. Time for completion of S106;
- c. Time allowed for land disposal if required;
- d. Time for approval of reserved matters;
- e. Time allowed for discharge of pre-commencement conditions;
- f. Time needed for site remediation and preparation;
- g. Time required for housing to be completed following site start date.

23 Gladman therefore conclude that on the basis of a 928 dwelling per annum requirement the plan as currently presented will provide for 4.08 years supply factoring in a 5% buffer or 3.57 years supply factoring in a 20% buffer. The plan must therefore be considered unsound. There is an urgent need for the Council to identify additional sites which can contribute to both the 5 year land supply and the overall plan requirement, Gladman have previously highlighted how this can be undertaken and proposed a number of sites which should be allocated to plug this gap.

Category	Council	Gladman	Difference
Allocations	2540	1812	728
PP	4260	3598	662
Wind	96	96	0
Total	6896	5506	1390

Buffer	Total	Years Supply on Council Figure	Years Supply on Gladman Figure
Requirement + 5%	6741	5.11	4.08
Requirement + 20%	7704	4.48	3.57

Appendix 1

5 Year Land Supply Data

Table 8.11										Colour Key		
Site location - Local Plan allocations	16/21	21/26	26/31	Claimed Status	Submitted?/Status/Dates	Application Number	Link		Likely delivery over 2016- 2021 period	Likely to be developed	Unlikely to be developed	Potential for development/ allocation unlikely to deliver specified amount.
H1 (4) Oakapple Lane, Barming	130	57		Pending	Reserved matters approved for "approx" 250 units in May 2016 - part of emerging allocation. Outline application for 80 units (south of Oakapple Lane) approved Dec 15	15/506324/REM - 250 units 13/2079 - 80 units	250 unit link	80 unit link	130			
H1 (7) Land North Of Bicknor Wood, Sutton Road, Maidstone,	170	20		Pending	Outline application submitted, validated 13/11/2015. Comprises 250 units.	15/509251/OUT	Link		90 - based on reserved matters approval by 2018 and 30 dpa until 2021			
H1 (8) West of Church Road, Otham	125	250	65	Pending	No Current application visible				0			
H1 (9) Land At Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road, Langley, ME17 3NG	140	195		Pending	Full application for 271 pending - submitted 29th April 2016.	16/503775/FULL	Link	loss of 64 units from predicted allocation	120 - based on approval by mid 2017 and 4 year build out at 30 dpa			
H1 (10) Land South Of, Sutton Road, Langley,	200	425	175	Pending	Outline application for up to 600 units permitted with a an immeditaely deliverable first phase of 170 units following permission. - approved sept 2014. Reserved matters for 162 units approved 13/05/2016 Outline application validated 10/11/2015 - awaiting decision with no unit quantity specified. Had and EA scoping opinion for 950 units	13/1149 - outline 15/502114/REM - Reserved Matters	Link to outline	Link to Reserved matters	200			Link to Other outline app, linked to 950 unit scoping opinion

H1 (11) Springfield site, Monktons Lane, Royal Engineers Rd MAIDSTONE	80	350	70	Pending	Outline application for 130 units withdrawn in June 2016. EIA Screening currently pending for 300 units but no other applications visible.	14/505741/OUT - Withdrawn app 16/506243/ENVSCR	Withdrawn app link	Screening app link	60 - Withdrawn app and current screening request indicates intent to develop. 60 units assumes permission by 2019 and 30 dpa	Full application for 192 flats approved 06/04/2006, submitted by Mountgrange Ltd. Modifications to permission still being made as late as April 2016. S106 signed in 2016.	05/2350- Original app 15/506426/MOD106 - 2016 modifications	Link to original application	Link to 2016 mods	180 - based on flat completion rate of 50 dpa - On same site as screening opinion for allocation H1(11) potentially double counted as a site allocation H1 (11)
H1 (12) 180-188 Union Street, Maidstone, ME14 1EY	30			S106	Application for 44 dwellings withdrawn in May 2016 - no other applications visible	15/508437/OUT	Link		0					
H1 (13) Medway Street, Maidstone		40		S106	No Current application visible, potential for development within 10 years				0					
H1 (14) American Golf, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone	60			Pending	Outline application for 65 dwellings - validated December 2015. Currently Pending	15/510179/OUT	Link		65					
H1 (15) 6 Tonbridge Road, Maidstone		15		Pending	No Current application visible, potential for development within 10 years				0					
H1 (17) Laguna, Hart Street, Maidstone	76			Pending	Application for 52 apartments and 24 flats submitted in 2008 and withdrawn. No other applications visible.	07/2133- Withdrawn app	Link		0					
H1 (18) Dunning Hall, Fremlin Walk, Week Street, Maidstone	14			Pending	No Current application visible				0					
H1 (19) 18-21 Foster Street, Maidstone	5			Pending	No Current application visible				0					

H1 (20) Wren's Cross, Upper Stone Street, Maidstone	60			Pending	Full application for 66 dwellings - validated 05/07/2016, currently pending. (Resubmission of withdrawn application 16/500537/FULL)	16/505425/FULL	Link		66
H1 (21) Land At Barty Farm, Roundwell, Bearsted, ME14 4HN	80	42		Pending	Outline application for 100 dwellings with "reserved matters approval being sought" (altered to a full application?) Validated 05/01/2015 - Pending	14/506738/OUT	Link		100
H1 (22) Whitmore Street, Maidstone		5		Pending	Deliverable within 10 years				0
H1 (23) Bell Farm, North Street, Barming	35			Pending	Full application for 35 units refused 05/11/2015 on the grounds of; urbanising character, site is within open countryside, loss of habitat, harm to heritage assets. - Currently appealing decision. "2nd attempt application (FULL) for 35 units also submitted; validated 13/07/2016, pending.	14/506419/FULL - 1st app 16/505427/FULL - 2nd app	Link to 1st application	Link to 2nd application	35 - small number of units and intent to develop demonstrates it will likely be developed by 2021.
H1 (24) Land At, Postley Road, Maidstone, ME15 6RH	62			S106	Outline application for 62 dwellings. Validated 28/11/2013; currently pending	13/2038	Link		62
H1 (25) Bridge Industrial Centre, Wharf Road, Tovil		15		Pending	No Current application visible, potential for development within 10 years				0
H1 (26) Tovil Working Men's Club, Tovil Hill, Maidstone	20			Pending	No Current application visible				0
H1 (27) Land Rear Of Police Headquarters Sutton Road, Maidstone	22	90		S106	Outline application for 112 units validated 26/11/2013, currently pending.	12/0986	Link		22
H1 (28) Land To Rear Of Kent Police Training School Off, St Saviours	18	72		S106	Outline application for up to 90 units validated 26/11/2013, currently pending	12/0987	Link		18

Road, Maidstone, ME15 9DW									
H1 (29) Land At, New Line Learning, Boughton Lane, Maidstone	130	50		Pending	Application for 220 units refused and lost at appeal 03/03/16. Refused predominantly on severity of traffic impacts on already congested roads. KCC highways stated they will not support an application in this location	13/2197	Link		0
H1 (30) West of Eclipse, Old Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone	35			Pending					? - No identified application, site has is identified as having planning history on councils website but no link provided. Potential for housing
H1 (31) Bearsted Station Goods Yard, Bearsted		20		Pending	No Current application visible, potential for development within 10 years				0
H1 (32) Land To The South Of, Cross Keys, Bearsted	50			S106	Application for 50 units approved 06/07/2016 - 106 signed	14/504795/FULL	Link		50
H1 (34) Mayfield Nursery, Ashford Road, Harrietsham, ME17 1BN	49			S106	Outline application for 49 units validated 01/11/2013 - Pending	13/1823	Link		49
H1 (38) Land East Of Thatch Barn Road And South Of, Lenham Road, Headcorn,	13			S106	Outline application for 13 dwellings approved on 15/07/2016 - awaiting 106	14/503960/OUT	Link		13
H1 (38) Land North Of, Grigg Lane, Headcorn,	28			S106	Outline application for 28 dwellings approved on 15/07/2016 - 106 signed	15/501342/OUT	Link		28

H1 (39) South of Grigg Lane, Headcorn		55		Pending	EIA screening for 96 units - decided not required on 24/03/2016. No other application submitted as yet.	16/501996/ENVSCR	Link		0
H1 (40) Knaves Acre, Headcorn		5		Pending	No application for multiple development at present. Pending application for single dwelling. Numerous permitted applications immediately surrounding allocation.	15/504300/OUT - Single dwelling app	Link		0
H1 (42) Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham		155		Pending	EIA screening for 155 units - deemed not required on 08/08/2016. No other applications submitted as yet.	16/504855/ENVSCR	Link		0
H1 (43) Land East Of Glebe Gardens, Old Ashford Road, Lenham	10			Pending	Outline application for 8 dwellings permitted on 07/07/2016. Allocation likely to remain as 8 units rather than 10.	14/0174	Link		8
H1 (48) Land south of the Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden	50			Pending	No current application but abuts permitted development to the north. Would likely be dependant on it for access.				20 - site is surrounded by permitted development, is a logical extension. Site to the north yet to begin construction so any delivery on this site would be towards the end of the 5 year period.
H1 (49) Hen And Duckhurst Farm, Marden Road, Staplehurst, TN12 0PD	164	86		S106	Outline application for 250 dwellings, validated 22/07/2014 - currently pending decision. No S106 visible.	14/502010/OUT	Link		120 - based on reserved matters approval by 2018 and 2 developers delivering combined 40 dpa until 2021

H1 (50) (Fishers Farm) Land North Of, Headcorn Road, Staplehurst, TN12 0DT	225	175		Pending	Two applications; 14/505432/FULL - for 167 units, validated 10/11/2014 15/510186/FULL - for 185 units, validated 15/12/2015, both applications currently pending. Applications on two different areas of the site	14/505432/FULL 15/510186/FULL	Link to 167 unit application	Link to 185 unit application	225 - Assuming permission by mid 2017 and 30 dpa build out on both sites (totalling 60 dpa)
H1 (51) Land to the North of Henhurst Farm, Staplehurst	30	30		Pending	No current application visible on allocation. Neighbouring site currently under construction so would be a logical next phase. Potential to come forward for development				20 - site neighbouring permitted development, is a logical extension. Site to the north yet to begin construction so any delivery on this site would be towards the end of the 5 year period.
H1 (52) Land West Of 73 Haste Hill Road, Boughton Monchelsea Kent ME17 4LN	20			Pending	Outline application for 11 dwellings validated 13/01/2016, pending. No other application to indiciate delivery of 20 units.	16/500014/OUT	Link	loss of 9 units from predicted allocation	11 - based on current application
H1 (53) Land at Boughton Lane, Boughton Monchelsea and Loose	75			Pending	No current application visible				0
H1 (54) Boughton Mount, Boughton Lane, Boughton Monchelsea		25		Pending	No current application visible, potential to develop within 10 years				0
H1 (55) Land At Church Street And Heath Road,	40			Pending	Full application for 41 units validated on 13/01/2016 - currently pending.	15/509961/FULL	Link		41

Boughton Monchelsea									
H1 (56) Lyewood Farm, Green Lane Boughton Monchelsea		25		Pending	No current application visible, potential to be developed within 10 years.				0
H1 (57) Land South Of Sunny Brae Hubbards Lane, Boughton Monchelsea, ME17 4HY		8		Pending	Outline application for 8 dwellings permitted on 29/04/2016	15/509907/OUT	Link		0
H1 (58) Linden Farm, Stockett Lane, East Farleigh, ME15 0QD	74			S106	Outline application for 74 units approved on 25/08/2016	13/2008	Link		74
H1 (60) Forstal Lane, Coxheath	90	105		Pending	No current application visible				0
H1 (61) Land North Of, Heath Road, Coxheath, ME17 4TB	55			S106	Outline application for 55 units, validated 19/11/2013 - pending.No S106 visible	13/1979	Link		55
H1 (63) East of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne	10			Pending	No current application visible, potential to be developed within 5 years.				0
H1 (65) Land adjacent to the Windmill Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne	15			Pending	No current application visible, potential to be developed within 5 years.				0
H1 (67) Vicarage Road, Yalding		65		Pending	No current application visible				0
H1 (68) Bentletts Farm, Claygate Road, Yalding, ME18 6BB	10			Pending	No current application visible, potential to be developed within 5 years. - Brownfield site				10

RMX1 (2) Maidstone East and Maidstone Sorting Office, Sandling Road, Maidstone		210		Pending	Outline application on site for commercial uses, no residential use. Application validated 09/06/2014 - pending. Unlikely to come forward based on current use and applications.	14/500483/OUT	Link		0
RMX1 (4) Former Syngenta Works, Hampstead Lane, Yalding	40	160		Pending	EIA scoping report validated 29/12/2008 - still pending. Previous outline permission for up to 350 dwellings; this was however withdrawn in 2008. No evidence to suggest site will come forward in the immediate to medium term future	08/2505 - EIA Scoping 07/1148 - Withdrawn application	EIA Scoping app link	Withdrawn app link	0
Claimed Total Dwellings	2540 (5 years)	2750 (10 years)	310 (15 years)					GDL Analysis Total Dwellings over 5 yea	1812

Table 8.1 - Extant Permission on sites over 100 dwellings

Site location - Extant Permissions	16/21	21/26	26/31	Claimed Status	Submitted?/Status/Dates	Application Number	Link		Likely delivery over 2016-2021 period
Land West Of, Hermitage Lane, Maidstone, Kent	160	90		Outline	Reserved Matters for 250 units approved May 2016. Bovis Homes submitted application.	15/506324/REM	Reserved Matters app link		160
Land To The East Of, Hermitage Lane, Maidstone	205	250	45	Outline	Outline application approved at appeal in 2014. Council subsequently appealed to SOS in October 2014 who found in favour of appellant subject to conditions in October 2015, including no more than 250 units to be developed until M20 junction upgrade takes place. No reserved matters application submitted.	13/1749	Link		120 - Based on size of site and reserved matters approval by 2018 (no RM apps yet submitted) and two developers delivering combined 40 dpa until 2021.
Bridge Nursery, London Road, Maidstone,	130			Full	Full application for 140 units approved July 2015, under construction. Ward Homes submitted application	14/501209/FULL	Link		130
Land North of Heath Road, Coxheath	110			Full	Full application for 110 units approved 18/09/2015. Minor amendment approved 03/08/2016. DHA Planning submitted application.	14/0836 - Full app	Link to Full app	Link to 2016 amendment	110
Land South Of Ashford Road, Harrietsham,	113			Full	Full application for up to 113 units approved 28/08/2015. Submission of details application still pending. Bidwells submitted application.	14/0828	Link		113
Land Between Mill Bank, Ulcombe Road & Kings 125 95 Out No Road, Headcorn, TN27 9LD	125	95		Outline	Hybrid outline application approved 13/11/2015, submitted by DHA Planning. No reserved matters submitted at present.	15/503325/HYBRID	Link		100 - Based on reserved matters approval by late 2017 and a single developer building 25 units per annum until 2021.
Miller House, 43-51 Lower Stone Street, Maidstone, ME15 6GB	99			PN for change of use	Application for PN to 99 units approved 21/04/2015, submitted by DPA London.	15/501881/PNJCLA	Link		99
Kent House, Romney Place, Maidstone, ME15 6LA	137			PN for change of use	Application for PN to 92 dwellings approved 05/09/2014, submitted by D2 Planning. Second PN application approved on 08/07/2015, number of units not specified, submitted by RMK Ltd.	14/500835/PNJCLA - 92 unit app 15/503837/PNOCLA - unspecified app	92 unit link	Unspecified unit link	92 - based on initial permission figure
The Parsonage, Land East Of Goudhurst Road, Marden	144			Outline	Reserved Matters for 144 units approved 18/07/2016, submitted by Redrow.	15/510438/REM	Link		144
Marden Cricket & Hockey Club, Stanley Road, Marden	124			Full	Full application approved 23/12/2015, submitted by Countryside Properties.	13/1928	Link		124

Springfield Park, Royal Engineers Road, Maidstone	180	12		Full	Full application for 192 flats approved 06/04/2006, submitted by Mountgrange Ltd. Modifications to permission still being made as late as April 2016. S106 signed in 2016.	05/2350- Original app 15/506426/MOD106 - 2016 modifications	Link to original application	Link to 2016 mods	0 - Likely double counted from policy H1(11)	
KCC Springfield Library Site, Sandling Road,		114		Outline	Outline application for 114 units approved 08/05/2014, submitted by DHA Planning. Non scheduled as coming forward within 5 years	12/2032.	Link		N/A	
Land North of Sutton Road, Otham	179			Full	Outline application for 186 dwellings approved 31/05/2013, submitted by Bellway Homes. No reserved matters submitted as yet.	13/0951	Link		100 - based on 30 dpa with reserved matters achieved and construction commencing towards the end of 2017	Potentially double counted in Maidstone supply - sites north of Sutton Road included in allocations table as Policy H1 (6).
Land off, Farleigh Hill, Tovil, Kent	72	200		Outline	Outline application permitted 23/11/2012, submitted by P.J. Burke Ltd. Reserved matters submitted for 272 dwellings on 20/11/2015 by PJ Burke, currently pending.	10/0256 - Outline application 15/509041/REM - Pending RM application	Outline application link	Pending reserved matters link	72	
Land At Langley Park, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent	404	155		Full	Outline application for up to 600 units permitted with an immediately deliverable first phase of 170 units following permission. - approved sept 2014. Reserved matters for 162 units approved 13/05/2016. Sites are currently under construction	13/1149 - outline 15/502114/REM - Reserved Matters	Link to outline	Link to Reserved matters	332 - based on currently permitted development and build out rates of approx 60 dpa (2 developers at 30dpa) with construction already commenced.	Potentially Double Counted as allocation H1 (10)
Tovil Quarry Site, Straw Mill Hill, Tovil, Maidstone, Kent, ME15 6FL		113		S106	Outline application permitted 29/04/2016, submitted by DHA Planning. No RM as yet. Will not be delivered in 2016-2021 period.	15/505441/OUT	Link		N/A	
Claimed Total Dwellings	2182 (5 years)	1029 (10 years)	45 (15 years)					GDL Analysis Total Dwellings over 5 years	1696	