

**REPORT SUMMARY**

<b>REFERENCE NO</b> 18/502553/FULL			
<b>APPLICATION PROPOSAL</b> Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two detached dwellings and replacement storage building (re-submission of 17/505937/FULL).			
<b>ADDRESS</b> Land To The South Of The Gables Marden Road Staplehurst TN12 0PE			
<b>RECOMMENDATION</b> REFUSE for the reason set out in Section 8.			
<b>SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is outside of any settlement as defined in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017. In these locations new residential development is not readily supported and the re-development of this site as a brownfield site would not comply with the local plan policy which requires significant environmental improvement and sustainability.</li> <li>• The design, scale and proportions of the proposed new housing and storage building (for which there is no policy justification) would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, failing to promote local distinctiveness and the intrinsic character of the countryside.</li> <li>• The added argument relating to the fallback position as discussed in the Court of Appeal Judgement (Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and Michael Mansell (C1/2016/4488) dated 08/09/2017) has been considered, however, the difference in the size, height and scale of the proposed dwellings would be substantial when compared with the existing buildings on the application site.</li> <li>• This revised application does not overcome the previous grounds for refusal.</li> </ul>			
<b>REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE</b>			
The application has been called in by Cllr Harwood on the grounds of the complex planning history on this site and efforts made by the applicant to overcome the stated concerns of local residents.			
<b>WARD</b> Staplehurst	<b>PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL</b> Staplehurst	<b>APPLICANT</b> Mr P R Garrod <b>AGENT</b> D C Hudson & Partner	
<b>DECISION DUE DATE</b> 11/09/2018	<b>PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE</b> 25/07/2018	<b>OFFICER SITE VISIT DATE</b> 20/06/2018	
<b>RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY</b>			
<b>App No</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
17/505937/FULL	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two detached dwellings and replacement storage building.	Refused	05/02/18
15/509275/OUT	Outline application with access	Refused	16/06/16

	matters reserved for proposed residential development following demolition of existing buildings with replacement storage building.		
Appeal	Summary of reasons: Harm to the character and appearance of the area	Dismissed	07/12/16
15/506076/PNP	Prior Notification for a change of use from a storage or distribution building (Class B8) and any land within the curtilage to a dwellinghouse (Class C3).	Granted	22/09/15
MA/89/0828	Relocated replacement building to form joinery shop	Granted	27/7/89

## **MAIN REPORT**

### **1.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

- 1.01 This site is accessed from Marden Road and is located to the rear of the existing residential property called The Gables. The main parcel of land is set back from the road by approximately 73m and is accessed by a narrow track that runs parallel to the curtilage of The Gables.
- 1.02 The site is currently occupied by a collection of pole barns and an agricultural storage building. In the centre of the site is an area of concrete hardstanding that covers the width of the site. These structures and area of hardstanding are set within mown grassland.
- 1.03 To the east of the site is a crane storage depot and to the south and west open countryside. Immediately to the south of the application site is an area of grassland under the same ownership as the application site, which appears to have been regularly mown.
- 1.04 The site is located within the open countryside, although no other designations apply. It is not located within a flood zone and there are no listed buildings in the immediate vicinity.
- 1.05 One of the three existing buildings on the site benefits from the grant of prior notification for the change of use from a storage distribution building to a dwellinghouse.

### **PROPOSAL**

#### **2.01 Access**

Access to the site would be from an existing track from Marden Road to the north, this would be upgraded and extended to accommodate access to the new hard, surfaced parking and turning area in front of the two new

dwellings and extended further southwards on to existing open land to provide access to the new storage building.

#### 2.02 New dwellings

It is proposed to demolish the existing buildings on the site and replace them with 2 no. 2-storey dwellings. These dwellings would be sited to the north of the site in a staggered pattern. The dwellings would be of differing designs, but both containing 4 no. bedrooms and would face onto a new parking and turning area. Garaging and off-street parking would be proposed. Both dwellings would have separate gardens to the south.

#### 2.03 Storage building

The existing storage building on the site would be removed to facilitate the new residential dwellings. A new replacement single storey storage building is proposed to the south-west of the site. This would have a shallow pitched roof with a green corrugated clad walls and roof. Full height access doors would be proposed in the front and side elevations.

2.04 The new storage building would be some 30 square metres larger in footprint than the existing building that it replaces with the new building also located further south into open countryside than existing buildings. No additional details of the proposed use of the building have been provided other than an indication it would be for storage.

### **3.0 POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Maidstone Local Plan 2017: SS1, SP5, SP17, DM1, DM2, DM3, DM5, DM23, DM30, DM32, DM33 and DM36

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Staplehurst Neighbourhood Plan: Key visions, Policy PW2 and Objective 11.

Supplementary Planning Documents: Maidstone Landscape Character Guidelines 2012

### **4.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

4.01 **Local Residents:** 2 representations received from local residents raising the following (summarised) issues:

- This site is not suitable for housing.
- It's been refused planning on several occasions and the land and conditions have not changed since the last applications.
- Our depot, Savage Cranes, works 24/7 and is inappropriate for homeowners. Despite sound proofing houses, gardens are not able to be quietened sufficiently. This was proved in a previous application.
- The land owner needs to trim hedging down to the required lawful height in line with recent legislation.
- The location plan has been drawn incorrectly

## **5.0 CONSULTATIONS**

*(Please note that summaries of consultation responses are set out below with the response discussed in more detail in the main report if considered necessary)*

- 5.01 **Staplehurst Parish Council:** Raises objections on the basis of the same reasons of previous application (15/509275), the development would be contrary to policy PW2 of the Staplehurst Neighbourhood Plan, the site is unallocated and, as such, contrary to policies SP5 and SP17, the development would harm the appearance and character of the countryside, the distance from the village centre and absence of a footway make the location unsustainable, the construction of the Hen and Duckhurst Farm would not 'significantly alter' the access and there had been known drainage and sewage issues in the area.
- 5.02 **KCC Highways:** No objections subject to conditions as the access provisions in this location would not raise any significant concerns. Query as to what provision will be made for the collection of refuse.
- 5.03 **Environmental Services:** No objections but informative requested
- 5.04 **Southern Water:** No objections subject to conditions and informatives
- 5.05 **Biodiversity:** No objections subject to a condition relating to mitigation strategies

## **6.0 APPRAISAL**

### **Main Issues**

- 6.01 The key issues for consideration relate to:  
Principle of development  
Sustainability  
Visual Impact  
The 'Fallback' position  
Residential amenity  
Highways Matters  
Ecology  
Other matters

### **Principle of development**

#### Policy and history background

- 6.02 The application site is outside the Staplehurst settlement boundary and as such can be described as being within the countryside as set out in Policy SP17 of the Local Plan 'The countryside is defined as all those parts of the plan area not within the development boundaries shown on the proposals map.'

- 6.03 Policy SP17 of the Local Plan sets out that, 'Development proposals in the countryside will not be permitted unless they accord with other policies in this plan and they will not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.'
- 6.04 Policy DM5 relates to brownfield sites and encourages the residential development of brownfield sites in the countryside which are not residential gardens, providing they are not of a high environmental value and are of an appropriate density. In addition, the redevelopment should also result in a significant environmental improvement and the site should or could be made accessible by sustainable modes to either the Maidstone urban area, a rural service centre or larger village.
- 6.05 Policy DM36 of the local plan allows for new agricultural buildings and structures, however no information is provided about the proposed new storage building to suggest that it is to be used for agricultural purposes. As such the proposal fails to meet the policy which requires the building to be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture.
- 6.06 Policy DM37 allows for the expansion of existing businesses in rural areas, however again the proposals do not address whether the new storage building is required in connection with an existing business, nor satisfy the policy criteria in all other respects.
- 6.07 The Staplehurst Neighbourhood plan sets out the vision for the Parish through until 2031. These key visions include :  
*Maintaining and enhancing the rural character of Staplehurst village, its immediate setting and the wider parish. Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the whole built environment and the wider countryside.*
- 6.08 Policy PW2 of the neighbourhood plan sets out considerations for new development in the countryside. It states that proposals will be assessed on the visual setting and landscape features of the site and its surroundings, impact on biodiversity and other relevant planning considerations. The plan supports the protection of the wider countryside and the proximity of Staplehurst to the countryside is an important part of the identity of the village.
- 6.09 Objective 11 relates to 'Create defined and welcoming gateways to the village when approached from the west, via the Marden Road.' The objective acknowledges the important definition between the extent of the village and the countryside beyond. It sets out that the village should be defined separately from the surrounding countryside.
- 6.10 In terms of the weight that can be attached to the prior notification approval, the Planning Inspector in his consideration of the appeal relating to 15/509275/OUT sets out that, 'Consequently, although the notification established the principle of residential development on the site, the physical

effects of the development permitted would not be comparable with the appeal proposal.' It should be noted that the prior notification is limited to the change of use of the building, a curtilage no larger than the building and does not allow for new built development.

- 6.11 Outline planning permission was applied for under application reference 15/509275/OUT. This application reserved all matters except access and did not specify the number of dwellings proposed, although indicative plans did show 4 dwellings. The outline consent also included the erection of a new storage building. Despite a positive officer recommendation, the planning committee refused planning permission for the following reason:

*The proposed development would be contrary to Policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and Policies SP5 and SP17 of the Submission Version of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (2016) in that it would be outside of the village envelope of Staplehurst and, being located in flat open countryside in the Low Weald, would be a jarring and harmful addition to the character and appearance of the countryside (both by day and by night) by reasons of a loss of its open character and associated domestic paraphernalia; and also in that this is an unsuitable location due to the absence of a footway on Marden Road and the distance of the site from the village centre.*

- 6.12 A subsequent appeal by the applicant was dismissed by the Planning Inspector, concluding harm to the character and appearance of the area and the development being unsustainable. The Inspectors decision on the appeal relating to application 15/509275 is a material planning consideration and carries more weight in consideration of this current application than the positive recommendation put forward by officers.

#### Material changes since the appeal decision

- 6.13 Since the appeal decision the Maidstone Local Plan has been adopted (October 2017) and the planning policies on which the proposal is assessed now carry full weight, with increased focus on design. In addition, the revised NPPF was adopted in July 2018. A further full application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of two detached dwellings and replacement storage building was submitted, referenced 17/505937/FULL. It was recommended for refusal and the decision was upheld by committee members. The application was refused on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2018.

#### History of applications

- 6.14 15/509275/OUT – Included an outline application for four dwellings and an agricultural building  
17/505937/FULL – Included a full application for two executive style, five bed dwellings and an agricultural building  
18/502553/FULL – Included a full application for two executive style, four bed dwellings and an agricultural building. In terms of footprint, the application was similar to the previous application. The bulk was marginally

reduced and the height of the dwellings was reduced. These differences are not considered sufficient to overcome the previous reason for refusal.

- 6.15 As with the previous application (17/505937/FULL), indicative landscaping is shown to the south of the application site to separate the rear gardens of Plots 1 and 2 with the open countryside, together with a landscape buffer separating the application site with The Gables to the north and landscaping along the western boundary. As this landscaping could have been conditioned by the Inspector had he been minded to allow the appeal on the outline application (15/509275), this landscaping could not be seen to remove the harm that the Inspector considered would result from this proposal.

#### Overall

- 6.16 The key issues are whether the proposed development would constitute sustainable development, thus complying with the aims of the NPPF and the Local and Neighbourhood Plan Policies. In addition, this application has to be assessed to examine whether the revised scheme overcomes the issues highlighted in the earlier appeal decision and subsequent planning application, and whether the redevelopment of a brownfield site would outweigh other material considerations such as the 'fallback' position. These are discussed in further detail below.

#### **Sustainability**

- 6.17 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF (2018) sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development, these being the economic, social and environmental roles. Paragraph 11 sets out that at the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and for decision making this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF (2018) sets out that 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.'

#### Economic role

- 6.18 The proposal is for a housing scheme comprising two dwellings. If granted, the development would create jobs during the construction phase and the new dwelling could support local businesses, however the economic role that two new dwellings would play in this location would be limited.

#### Social role and Environmental role (including visual impact)

- 6.19 The NPPF (2018) sets out that the social role should support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations, and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs.

- 6.20 The environmental role as set out in the NPPF (2018) states that the planning system should 'contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment', overlapping somewhat with the social role.
- 6.21 The Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and as such there is no overriding need to identify additional housing sites. Although windfall development such as that proposed would contribute to the overall supply, the hierarchy in the Local Plan directs this type of development to sustainable locations.
- 6.22 The social and environmental role requires the creation of a high quality built environment. Policy SP17 of the local plan sets out the criteria for assessing development within the countryside which includes, that proposals will not be permitted unless they accord with other policies in the plan and will not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Policy DM30 sets out that 'The type, siting, materials and design, mass and scale of development...would maintain, or where possible, enhance local distinctiveness including landscape features.' and that 'any new buildings should, where practicable, be located adjacent to existing buildings or be unobtrusively located and well screened by existing or proposed vegetation which reflects the landscape character of the area'.
- 6.23 Policy DM12 of the Local Plan sets out that, 'All new housing will be developed at a density that is consistent with achieving good design and does not compromise the distinctive character of the area in which it is situated.'
- 6.24 Policy DM1 of the Local Plan sets out amongst other criteria, that development should 'Respond positively to and, where possible, enhance the local....character of the area. Particular regard will be paid to scale, height, materials, detailing, mass, bulk, articulation and vernacular materials where appropriate.'
- Visual impact**
- 6.25 The previous appeal decision highlights that harm would result to the character and appearance of the area. A copy of the decision is appended to this report and key paragraphs which relate are 5, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 12.
- 6.26 Paragraph 6 in particular states, 'Notwithstanding that the exact number and layout of the dwellings has not been determined, new buildings on the scale shown in the indicative scheme, together with the up-graded access and domestic boundary enclosures, would have a urbanised effect compared with the existing collection of more modest, utilitarian buildings. The height, volume and spread of buildings would increase significantly and the low key, utilitarian character of the site would be replaced by a more intensive residential use.'
- 6.27 As set out earlier, the scale of the new buildings has been reduced when compared to the previous development proposal (discussed before committee on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2018) comprised two 5-bedroomed, 2-storey executive style



dwellings, which would be in stark contrast to the modest utilitarian buildings currently on the site. The site enabled parking and turning for vehicles, and the subdivision of the plot allowed for 2 dwellings. It was refused on the basis that it introduced additional built development, mass and height of buildings in an area where development is concentrated along the road frontage or is well screened when it encroaches into land to the south.

- 6.28 The current proposal comprises two 4 bedroomed, two storey executive style dwellings in this backland location, which would still be a stark contrast to the utilitarian buildings currently on the site and the pattern of local development. The access road is to be upgraded and extended further into the open countryside to accommodate the new storage building. Each dwelling would benefit from two parking spaces adjacent to the turning area, with a single garage set further back in the plots behind the parking spaces.
- 6.29 DM5 of the Local Plan considers that, in exceptional cases, residential development of brownfield sites in the countryside which are not residential gardens, are of an acceptable density and providing the site is not of notable environmental value, will be permitted provided that the scheme would result in a significant residential improvement and the site is reasonably accessible by sustainable modes to Maidstone urban area, a rural service Centre or larger village. It is the officer's view that due to the character and appearance of the existing site, which has limited impact on the landscape, the proposed scheme would not result in a significant environmental improvement (as required by Policy DM5 of the Local Plan) and would not overcome the previous reasons for refusal and Inspectors decision.
- 6.30 The impact on the character and appearance of the area is further exacerbated by the proposed new storage building which would encroach into open countryside to the south. There is no policy justification for this building, which would be of larger proportions than the existing buildings on the site. These issues were also agreed at committee during the assessment of the previous application.

Accessibility of the site

- 6.31 The Inspector in his earlier decision concluded that the site was not sustainable in terms of its location. Paragraph 13 of his decision states, 'There is no dispute that Staplehurst itself is a sustainable settlement. However its services and facilities are concentrated within the built up area at least 1.1km from the site. The nearest bus stop is some 0.9km away. The route from the appeal site along Marden Road is unlit and has no footpaths for the first 250m. The road is subject to a 40mph speed limit and is fairly busy with traffic. Whilst there are grass verges next to the carriageway, they are narrow and uneven in places. I found on the site visit that walking this part of route is uncomfortable and would not be attractive for trips during the day, much less during hours of darkness'.

- 6.32 No circumstances have changed on site, no additional mitigation is proposed to improve access (for example a footway along Marden Road and it is doubtful as to whether this would be achievable) and therefore the conclusions of the Inspector remain material. There is no reason found to depart from the Inspector's conclusion that the site would rely on private vehicle use and cannot be considered sustainably accessible. This is also consistent with the previous decision.

#### Overall

- 6.33 For these reasons the proposed development would not fulfil the social or environmental role of sustainable development; it would not meet national or local plan policies which seek to promote high quality development and maintaining/enhancing the character of the local area, and promoting distinctiveness. The development would not result in a significant environmental improvement nor would the site be made reasonably accessible by sustainable modes to Staplehurst or any other urban area, rural service centre or larger village. As such, the development would not comply with policy DM5 which allows for brownfield redevelopment and paras 7 and 8 relating to achieving sustainable development of the NPPF (2018).

#### **The 'Fallback' position**

- 6.34 In terms of the weight that can be attached to the prior notification approval, the Planning Inspector in his consideration of the appeal relating to 15/509275/OUT sets out that, 'Consequently, although the notification established the principle of residential development on the site, the physical effects of the development permitted would not be comparable with the appeal proposal.' It should be noted that the prior notification is limited to the change of use of the building, a curtilage no larger than the building and does not allow for new built development.
- 6.35 This current application has been submitted following a Court of Appeal decision that considered a fallback position (Michael Mansell and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council referenced C1/2016/4488 dated 8<sup>th</sup> September 2017). The design and access statement argues that there are similarities between the proposal that was the subject of the Court of Appeal decision and the application that is the subject of this committee report.
- 6.36 The subject of the Court of Appeal decision related to an application for full planning application where the likelihood of the proposal achieving separate prior approval under Class Q was assessed as part of the planning application. In the Tonbridge and Malling application the case officer concluded that the application for new build residential development would have a better outcome than that which would result from the applicant applying and receiving prior approval for the conversion of an existing barn. The Court of Appeal found that it was right for the fallback position to be assessed as part of the consideration of a planning application.

- 6.37 In assessing the fallback position the existing buildings on the application site need to be considered in terms of the likelihood of approval for residential use under the prior approval system. The existing buildings on the site consist of a corrugated metal building used for storage and two single storey open timber pole barns. The applicant has received prior approval for the conversion of the corrugated metal building into a single residential unit (15/506076/PNP).
- 6.38 The other two buildings on the site did not form part of the successful prior approval application. Without prejudice to any future planning application, and after assessing these buildings and relevant case law it is considered unlikely that prior approval would be given for the use of the two buildings for the residential use. This is due to the extent of works that would be required to make the currently open buildings habitable. The level of work required would represent a rebuild rather than a conversion and as a result could not be considered under the prior approval system.
- 6.39 In the unlikely event that the existing two existing buildings could be given prior approval for residential accommodation, this would in addition be the preferred option when compared with the significant increase in height and bulk of development proposed as part of the current planning application. In this context the current proposal is significantly different than the proposal considered as part of the Court of Appeal judgment.

#### Overall

- 6.40 In terms of assessing a potential fallback position, unlike the other building on the site, the applicant chose not to submit a prior approval application for the two open pole barns. It is unlikely that prior approval would be given for residential use of the two pole barns as the extent of works required would not represent the conversion of the buildings, but a rebuild. In the unlikely event that prior approval was given for the residential use of the two pole barns, the fallback position in the use of these buildings would be preferred option over the current proposal for buildings for greater height and scale.

#### **Residential amenity**

- 6.41 The site is located to the rear (south) of The Gables, which is located adjacent to the road. The proposed new properties would be approximately 45m from the main house and this would be a sufficient distance for any impact in terms of amenity issues to be alleviated. In terms of additional traffic, it is not considered that the resultant noise and disturbance would increase to an unacceptable level.
- 6.42 Neighbour consultation letters have raised concerns in relation to the neighbouring commercial crane hire use. The concerns relate to the excessive noise levels generated from this site, sometimes during unsociable hours. Planning history for this site demonstrates there is no restriction on

the hours of this neighbouring use. An established use certificate for "storage of materials, plant and equipment, the ancillary repair of same and for the storage of lorries necessary to transport the same" was awarded in 1989 (referenced 89/1681), and aerial photos demonstrate that this has been a continuous use.

- 6.43 In consultation with Environmental Health on the earlier applications, the following mitigation measures were agreed.
- a) The double glazing will be 6-12-6 glazing (improved noise insulation).
  - b) There will be whole house ventilation to all rooms, rather than individual mechanical ventilation to each room.
  - c) There will be no windows to habitable rooms on the elevation to the houses facing the yard, whatever the final layout.
  - d) The fence between the proposed housing and yard will be 2.4 metres in height.
- 6.44 Although these details have not been put forward with the current submission, these matters have previously been discussed and could reasonably be dealt with by way of a planning condition if approval is given. With this in mind, it is considered that the proposal, suitably conditioned, could provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants.

### **Highway matters**

- 6.45 It has been confirmed by KCC Highways that the access provisions in this location would not raise any significant highway concerns. For this reason, I am satisfied that the site access would be acceptable.

### **Ecology**

- 6.46 There is no requirement for ecological surveys to be submitted as part of this application. The habitat onsite is regular mowed grassland, hard standing and buildings that are unlikely to provide suitability for roosting bats or other wildlife. In addition, any impact in terms of reptiles and Great Crested Newts would be avoided by implementing a mitigation strategy.
- 6.47 For these reasons, should members be minded to approve the application, a condition requiring a mitigation strategy and ecological enhancements within the site should be sought.

### **Other Matters**

- 6.48 Concerns have been raised in relation to drainage. The proposal is to contain any surface drainage within the site using a sustainable urban drainage system. If the proposal is otherwise considered acceptable a planning condition can be attached to an approval to secure this.

- 6.49 There has been no objection from Southern Water subject to appropriate planning conditions on the means of surface water disposal.
- 6.50 Taking this into account, the drainage for this site is considered to be acceptable.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.01 The site is outside of any settlement as defined in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017. The application fails to meet the relevant requirements for new residential development in these locations in relation to sustainability and design. The re-development of this brownfield land would not comply with the policies as set out in the Local Plan which requires significant environmental improvement and sustainability.
- 7.02 The design, scale and proportions of the new housing and storage building (for which there is no policy justification) would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, failing to promote local distinctiveness and the intrinsic character of the countryside.
- 7.03 Whilst there is unlikely to be a relevant 'fallback' position, if considered acceptable the residential use of existing buildings on the site brought into a habitable state would be the preferred option when considered against the height, scale, size, bulk and massing of the current development proposal.
- 7.04 This revised application does not overcome the previous reasons for the refusal of planning permission.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the National Planning Practice Guidance 2012, Policies SP5, SP17, DM1, DM3, DM5, DM12, DM30 and DM32 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan October 2017 and the visions, Policy PW2 and Objective 11 of the Staplehurst Neighbourhood Plan in that it would be outside of the settlement boundary of Staplehurst and, being located in flat open countryside in the Low Weald, would be a jarring and harmful addition to the character and appearance of the countryside (both by day and by night) by reasons of a loss of open character and associated domestic paraphernalia; and also in that this is an unsuitable location due to the absence of a footway on Marden Road and the distance of the site from the village centre.

Case Officer: Jocelyn Miller

NB: For full details of all papers submitted with this application please refer to the relevant Public Access pages on the council's website.

Planning Committee Report  
27 September 2018

Case Officer Jocelyn Miller