

REFERENCE NO - 18/504803/FULL			
APPLICATION PROPOSAL Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 7no. dwellings with associated amenity space, landscaping and access.			
ADDRESS The Old Forge Works Chartway Street East Sutton Maidstone Kent ME17 3DW			
RECOMMENDATION Refuse planning permission			
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION The development will provide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an unsustainable form of housing development in the countryside; • the size, design and siting of the development proposal is at odds with the more spacious and widely separated character of nearby development; • the proposal will result in an unacceptable consolidation of existing sporadic development in the locality and a substantial encroachment into adjoining open countryside; • the proximity of plot 5 with plot 4 would result in an awkward and overbearing relationship detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers; • failure to demonstrate that the development will not result in harm to highway safety and that the proposal will provide an adequate standard of access; • failure to demonstrate (including the absence of adequate detail with regard to acoustic mitigation) that the development will provide an adequate standard of residential accommodation 			
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE Councillor Round requested that this application is heard at committee as he believes it raises issues that need to be appropriately considered and balanced, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need for housing in rural areas, and the reuse of brown field land; • landscape and its treatment in a sensitive area; • Apparent enhancement of the landscape together with ecological benefit may conflict with sustainability in such rural areas. 			
WARD Headcorn	PARISH/TOWN East Sutton	COUNCIL	APPLICANT Kent Forklifts Ltd AGENT DHA Planning
TARGET DECISION DATE 08/04/19 (Extension of Time)		PUBLICITY EXPIRY DATE 19/10/18	

Relevant Planning History

16/500037/FULL

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 6 No dwellinghouses, amenity space, landscaping and access.

Refused 16.06.2016 for the following reasons:

1. Unsustainable form of housing development in the countryside
2. The size, design, siting and suburban and inward-looking layout, would materially depart from the more spacious and widely separated character of nearby development, out of character with this rural location as a consequence. In addition it is an unacceptable consolidation of existing sporadic development in the locality and an encroachment into adjoining open countryside.

18/500265/FULL

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 7no. dwellings with associated amenity space, landscaping and access.

Refused 31.05.2018 for the following reasons:

1. Unsustainable form of housing development in the countryside

2. The size, design, siting and suburban and inward-looking layout, would materially depart from the more spacious and widely separated character of nearby development, out of character with this rural location as a consequence. In addition it is an unacceptable consolidation of existing sporadic development in the locality and an encroachment into adjoining open countryside

3. The close proximity of plot 5 with plot 4 would result in an awkward and overbearing relationship detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers

4. The application has failed to demonstrate (including the absence of adequate detail with regard to visibility splays) that the development will not result in harm to highway safety and that the proposal will provide an adequate standard of access

5. The application has failed to demonstrate (including the absence of adequate detail with regard to acoustic mitigation that the development will provide an adequate standard of residential accommodation.

MAIN REPORT

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

- 1.01 The site is in the countryside, outside the urban area of Maidstone, outside the local plan designated Rural Service Centres and the Larger Villages. The site is not subject to any specific landscape designation.
- 1.02 The application site can be divided into 2 clearly distinct areas. The front part of the site comprises a workshop building that extends just over 40 metres back from the road frontage. This building is currently occupied by a food distribution company which I believe employs 2 people. Previously the commercial units on the site have been occupied by a horticultural bulb sales company. The site is accessed off Chartway Street to the west of this building where associated parking and turning areas are also located.
- 1.03 The second much larger area to the south and rear of the site comprises an open field (agricultural land classification of Grade 2) that is enclosed on its east and southern boundaries by hedgerows. This land is currently vacant.
- 1.04 The application site is located on the south side of Chartway Street just over 220 metres from the junction with Charlton Lane to the west, and over 150 metres from the junction with Morry Lane to the east. To the west of the application site is Old Forge House. The substantial buildings and open storage area that form part of the agricultural distribution operations at Street Farm abut and wrap around the western site boundary. To the east of the site are a pair of detached cottages known as 1 and 2 Manor Farm Cottages.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.01 The proposal is for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 7 dwellings with associated amenity space, landscaping and access. The access off Chartway Street would run south through the plot to the rear of the site. The existing access road on the site is approximately 9 metres wide to the side of the commercial building. The proposal is to widen the access at the entrance to the site to 14 metres, before rapidly tapering in to 5.5 metres approximately 5 metres in from the entrance. The dwellings would be located to the east and west of the access, with plot 5 at the end. An orchard would be located to the far south of the land with an area of approximately 0.25 hectares. The orchard would represent approximately 35% of the site area compared with 65% developed area.
- 2.02 Plot one comprises a three bedroom detached dwelling to the west of the site, with a pitched roof and gable ends, a pitched and gable fronted porch on the front of the building, and a two storey rear element extended further into the garden area with a hipped and pitched roof. The dwelling would have separate kitchen, dining and living areas, with a cloakroom and hallway on the ground floor, and three bedrooms, a bathroom, en suite and dressing room on the first floor. A pitched roof barn-style double car port with two barn hips would be located to the rear of the garden area, on which a refuse and garden store would be attached, with a pitched roof and gable end.

- 2.03 Plots 2, 3 and 4 would be located to the south of plot 1, comprising two storey terraced properties with a pitched roof hipped in on both sides. Catslide roofs are incorporated into the south and west elevations, and a covered area with a pitched roof and gable sides proves a focal point for two front entrances, while the third is located within a two storey gable fronted element projecting slightly forward of the main front façade of the plots. Each property would have a kitchen, and open plan dining/living/family room, cloakroom and hallway on the ground floor, and three bedrooms, a bathroom and an en suite on the first floor. On the north elevation there is a triple carport with a pitched roof hipped in at the side, with storage for each property contained within it
- 2.04 Plot 5 would be located to the east of plot 4, comprising a detached two storey property with a pitched roof including a catslide on the east elevation, a gable ended west elevation and a two storey gable fronted element on the front (north) elevation adjacent to an open porch area. The property would comprise a hall, kitchen with open plan family/breakfast area, utility, cloakroom, dining room, study and drawing room on the ground floor, and five bedrooms, a bathroom, and two en suites on the first floor. To the northeast of the dwelling a barn-style triple bay car port would be located, with a pitched roof hipped in one side and with a barn hip on the other. Two garden stores and two cycle stores would be attached to the rear of the building. It should be noted that two car spaces and the larger garden store and cycle store would be for the use of plot 5, and one car space and the smaller cycle and garden stores would be for the use of plot 6.
- 2.05 Plots 6 and 7 would comprise a pair of semi-detached properties with a pitched roof hipped in on the south elevation and with a barn hip on the north elevation. Two single storey elements would denote porches at the front of each property, and both properties would have two storey rear elements extending into the garden areas with pitched, hipped roofs. Each dwelling would have a hallway, kitchen/breakfast room, dining room, living room and cloakroom on the ground floor, with three bedrooms, a bathroom, dressing room and en suite at first floor. Plot 7 would have a single carport with a hipped, pitched roof, and a cycle and garden store to the rear.
- 2.06 The previous application referenced 16/500037/FULL was for six large, detached dwellings with garages. The current application is for seven dwellings of a more varied mix from 3 to 5 bedrooms. Along with the alterations to the siting and layout of the properties, this application would also include a pair of semi-detached dwellings and three terraced properties.
- 2.07 The application referenced 18/500265/FULL appears to be identical to this current application.

2. **POLICY AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017: SS1, SP17, SP21, DM1, DM2, DM4, DM5, DM12
DM23 and DM30

Supplementary Planning Documents: Maidstone Landscape Character Guidance 2012

3. **LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

Local Residents:

- 3.01 12 representations received from local residents raising the following (summarised) issues
- No difference to previously refused application
 - Design and layout out of character with locality (most housing in this location is linear, not set back into the site).
 - Out of date traffic surveys submitted
 - No attempt to address previous reasons for refusal
 - Inaccuracies in planning statement
 - No GPs or other amenities nearby
 - Public transport unreliable
 - Increase in traffic

- Site functions well as light industrial use and offers have been made to put the field to use.
- Noise, smells and disturbance due to location of bins and lack of appropriate boundary treatment
- Detrimental impact on the wildlife in the area
- Loss of light to amenity area
- Loss of commercial use of the site
- Intensification of use of the site
- No employment opportunities for the type of people likely to be interested in purchasing one of the properties within walking distance of the site.
- There is no access to the proposed orchard

3.02 Officer comment: Issues relating to lack of mains gas, drainage and poor water supply pressure in this area are not material planning considerations and therefore cannot be taken into account in the determination of this application. The other matters raised by neighbours and other objectors are discussed in the detailed assessment below.

4. CONSULTATIONS

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

Natural England

4.01 No comment

MBC Environmental Services

4.02 Objection. In the absence of a noise report, this application should be refused. In terms of contamination issues, in the event that the Council view this application favourably, a contamination condition should be added.

East Sutton Parish Council

4.03 Objection. The site is not sustainable, visibility splays are not achievable, loss of agricultural land, loss of employment land. The proposal is out of character with the surrounding street scene.

Broomfield and Kingwood Parish Council

4.04 Objection. Councillors felt that with no changes from the previous application the previous reasons for refusing the application are still valid. The site is in an unsustainable location with the development encroaching into open countryside which will be out of character with the locality. In addition whilst the Forge Works itself is on brownfield land, the land behind the Forge Works is agricultural land. The development is contrary to local character with Chartway Street a street of linear development.

KCC Ecology

4.05 No objection subject to conditions. It is noted that the hedgerows are to be retained, but the rubble piles within the site would be cleared, and these may have been utilised by reptiles or amphibians. On this basis, we advise that the open space area must be designed and managed to create suitable habitats for amphibians/reptiles and the tall ruderal/rubble piles must be cleared using a precautionary mitigation strategy. In addition, a management plan should be introduced in order to comply with NPPF legislation to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments.

KCC Highways

4.06 Further information is requested prior to finalising a response from highways: The speed data and visibility splay information is incomplete. The swept path analysis hasn't been included with this application however, it was included in the previous application referenced 18/500265/FULL which demonstrates there is enough spaces for vehicles to turn within the site.

KCC Public Rights of Way Officer

- 4.07 Requests that an informative is added reminding the applicant that the granting of planning permission does not include any other consents in relation to Public Rights of Way. Should any works be likely to affect it the applicant is advised to contact the Highways Section.

MBC Landscape officer

- 4.08 No objections subject to conditions. Overall, the proposed layout as shown on the site layout plan (drawing no DHA/11086/24) is acceptable from an arboricultural perspective although it should be advised by way of an informative (should the application be considered acceptable) that the boundary hedge shown to be retained to the rear of 2 Manor Farm Cottages is subject to a High Hedge remedial notice.
- 4.09 The indicative landscape shown on the site layout plan is reasonable in terms of its use of native species and the introduction of a orchard planting is welcomed. More detailed landscape plans together with suitable long-term management proposals should be submitted all of which could be secured by way of appropriate conditions.

Southern Water

- 4.10 No objections. The applicant is advised to contact the Environment Agency to discuss the use of a septic tank drainage, which disposes of effluent to sub-soil irrigation. The applicant will also need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities, in order to prevent flooding in future years. The drainage relating to the SUDS scheme should, specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SUDS scheme should:
- Specify a timetable for implementation
 - Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
 - Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SUDS scheme

Environment Agency

- 4.11 No objections to the development proposal providing contamination and drainage conditions are imposed and no pile foundations.

Archaeology

- 4.12 No objections subject to conditions. There is the potential for surviving archaeological remains associated with this post-medieval activity either relating to the smithy or surrounding farmsteads. As such, an archaeological watching brief is recommended should the application be considered acceptable.

Campaign for the Protection of Rural England

- 4.13 CPRE questions whether this site is a genuine brownfield site, with development on brownfield land supported building. Of further concern is foul drainage as plots 1, 2 and 3 are too small to accommodate cesspools.

APPRAISAL

Main Issues

- 5.0 The key issues for consideration relate to:
- Principle and sustainability
 - Impact on the character of the surrounding countryside
 - Design and layout of the proposed properties.
 - Impact on outlook and amenity of properties overlooking and abutting the site
 - Trees and landscape
 - Ecology
 - Archaeology
 - Highways and parking considerations.

Principle and sustainability

- 5.01 Adopted Local Plan policy SS1 relates to the provision of the Borough's housing supply. It demonstrates that local housing targets can be met by using land within the existing settlements and on sites with the least constraints on the edge of settlements. It describes the most sustainable locations for the provision for new housing in a sustainability

hierarchy with the urban area of Maidstone at the top of this hierarchy followed by the Rural Service Centres as the secondary focus. Larger villages are the third and final location as they may provide a limited supply of housing providing it is proportional to the scale and role of the villages. This application, does not meet these siting preferences and as such, the proposal represents unsustainable development in the countryside.

- 5.02 In February this year, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHLG) published the results of the housing delivery test. In the assessment, local authorities hitting 95% of the target or higher do not need to take any action with regard to their housing supply. The current published figure of 112% show that Maidstone BC has comfortably exceeded this target. This demonstrates that the local authority have a record of providing sufficient land to meet housing need. In addition the council can demonstrate a future five year housing land supply in sustainable locations in order to meet the housing land supply.
- 5.03 The applicant argues that the application site is located within close proximity to Kingswood, which has a number of amenities for the future occupiers. It is highlighted by officers that the village is some 700 metres from the application site. Given this distance and the unsatisfactory access by way of narrow, unlit country roads without pavements it is highly unlikely residents of the proposed development would walk or cycle to Kingswood. In addition, it should be noted that Kingswood village does not have the level of facilities to be included in the sustainability hierarchy set out as part of adopted policy SS1.
- 5.04 The application site is not accessible to the designated rural service centres or larger villages due to inadequate facilities for pedestrians and inadequate public transport. In conclusion, future residents would be reliant on the private car for 'day to day' basic needs. Policy SS1 sets out that development should be located in sustainable locations, and this proposal does not comply with this requirement.
- 5.05 Policy DM5 relates to development on brownfield land. The policy states that where a site is not of high environmental value and where residential density is acceptable redevelopment of brownfield sites will be permitted in certain circumstances. These circumstances include where the proposal would result in significant environmental improvement and the site is, or can reasonably be made, accessible by sustainable modes to Maidstone urban area, a rural service centre or larger village.'
- 5.06 The site is located 2 km from Sutton Valence (a larger village), 4 km from Harrietsham (a Rural service Centre) and 5km from Headcorn (a Rural Service centre). As set out above the application site is not in a sustainable location and with the distances involved the site cannot be made accessible to Maidstone urban area, a rural service centre or larger village. With no significant environmental improvement and the location of the site the proposal is contrary to adopted policy DM5.
- 5.07 In conclusion, the development proposal would be in an unsustainable location and would be contrary to policies SS1, and DM5 of the Maidstone Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Loss of commercial floorspace

- 5.08 Local Plan policy SP21 states that the council will prioritise the commercial re-use of existing rural buildings in the countryside over conversion to residential use in accordance with policy DM31. Whilst the proposed development would result in the demolition of a building providing 496 square metres of B8 (storage and distribution) commercial floorspace, policy SP21 considers the 'conversion' of commercial buildings and as a result this policy is not considered relevant

Impact on the character of the countryside

- 5.09 Policy SP17 defines the countryside as '...all those parts of the plan area outside the settlement boundaries of the Maidstone urban area, rural service centres and larger villages defined on the policy map.' Development proposals in the countryside will not be

permitted if they result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Policy DM30 states that in the countryside proposals will be permitted which would create high quality design, and where the type, siting, materials and design, mass and scale of development and the level of activity would maintain, or where possible, enhance local distinctiveness including landscape features.

- 5.10 The loss of the existing building, although not problematic in itself would open up views from Chartway street resulting in the site becoming more visible and increasing the impact of the proposed development on the character of the surrounding area. The development would be visible through the site and longer views may be gained further along the road at the junction with Morrey Lane. The site would also be viewed from long vantage points on public right of way KH531.
- 5.11 As the rear of the site is currently undeveloped land in the countryside, the introduction of new dwellings in this location is inappropriate development. The siting of this development proposal, in conjunction with the number, height, bulk and massing of the two storey dwellings (of varied styles) mainly to the rear of the site, and with large carports further adding to the building mass, would result in an urbanising effect that would be detrimental to the openness and rural character of the area. The proposed development is out of character with the locality and would have an adverse impact on the countryside contrary to policies SP17 and DM30.

Design and layout of the proposed properties

- 5.12 The proposed development would comprise 7 dwellings of mixed sizes and styles. The various designs would provide a good general layout and good access into and through the site. The properties will be provided with an adequate area of private rear garden.
- 5.13 The layout shows an informal inward looking cul de sac which is considered to meet the Councils normal block spacing, privacy and amenity space standards. While the layout is acceptable in its own right, the resultant suburban appearance and density differs substantially from the sporadic character of nearby development. The development would appear incongruous and out of character in this rural location as a consequence.

Standard of proposed accommodation

- 5.14 Policy DM1 supports development which provides adequate residential amenities for future occupiers of the development including in relation to excessive noise, activity or vehicular movements, overlooking or visual intrusion.
- 5.15 The proposed layout includes two directly opposing bedroom windows on the north and south elevations of plots 5 and 6 that are 12.5 metres apart. As the bedroom window to plot 6 is a secondary window (with the primary bedroom window on the west elevation), in the event that all other matters were acceptable a condition would be recommended seeking the south-facing window to this room to be obscure glazed.
- 5.16 At the southernmost part of the site, plot 5 overlaps plot 4 by approximately 4 metres. Two windows to a drawing room would be sited approximately 2.5 metres from plot 5. As this room has an alternative window over looking the rear amenity area of the property, any undue impact would be minimised. At first floor level, the only window serving the master bedroom would be partially obscured by the corner of plot 5. The views from the window would look down onto the front of plot 5. The siting, location and gable-ended design of plot 5 in close proximity to the southeast of the terraces on plots 2, 3 and 4, would have an overbearing impact which would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of future occupiers.
- 5.17 Plot 1 would be approximately 9 metres from the neighbouring property Old Forge House. The proposed dwelling would have windows on the ground floor serving the dining room and cloakroom. There is currently a 2.5 metre fence on the boundary of the property abutting the neighbour's garage which also forms part on the boundary. Subject to no

further windows being permitted on the western elevation of this property issues relating to the amenity of the neighbours and future occupiers would be alleviated.

- 5.18 The site is close to a busy road and adjacent to what appears to be a working farm operating HGV deliveries in the yard relating to the distribution of goods. Environmental Services have commented that despite these potential sources of nuisance no assessment of noise from the yard or the road has been submitted with the application. Officers made repeated requests to the planning agent for the submission of this assessment during the consideration of the application. The absence of this noise assessment is cause for concern as the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed residential accommodation will provide an adequate standard of accommodation for future occupiers.
- 5.19 Environmental Services have also commented that due to the previous commercial use of the site there is potential for land contamination to have occurred. In the event that the application is acceptable in all other aspects, a contamination condition should be added.

Impact on neighbours outlook and amenity

- 5.20 Policy DM1 supports development which respects the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties by ensuring that development does not result in overlooking or visual intrusion.
- 5.21 Nos 1 and 2 Manor Farm Cottages are located to the northeast of the application site. Although it would be 1.5 metres from the boundary hedge, there would be a gap of approximately 17 metres between the rear elevation of these existing properties and the closest proposed building (the carport at Plot 7). This car port would have a relatively modest height (2.5 metres to the eaves and 6.0 metres to the ridge) in comparison with the dwelling (gable ended ridge height of 9.3 metres). There would be no side windows on the north elevation of this property that faces towards Manor Farm Cottages. The distance between the proposed properties and the retained 6 metre high boundary hedging, would be sufficient to avoid any overlooking or loss of privacy impact on the neighbours at ground floor, although if minded to approve a condition would be recommended to restrict windows at first floor level.

Trees and landscape

- 5.22 The proposed layout is considered acceptable from an arboricultural perspective. An informative should be added to any recommendation for approval that a High Hedge remedial order is in place on the northern boundary of the site.
- 5.23 The indicative landscape shown on the site layout plan is considered reasonable in terms of its use of native species, and the introduction of orchard planting is welcomed. In the event that approval is given more detailed landscape plans together with suitable long-term management proposals should be submitted by way of conditions.

Biodiversity

- 5.24 There is no requirement for specific species surveys to be carried out. However, the open space area must be designed and managed to create suitable for habitats for amphibians/reptiles and the tall ruderal/rubble piles must be cleared using a precautionary mitigation strategy. Conditions relating to habitat creation and mitigation strategy are recommended should the decision be favourable.

Archaeology

- 5.25 The site is located within an area of archaeological potential and is adjacent to a smithy which was present in both the 19th and 20th centuries. Should the application be approved a watching brief condition should be attached.

Highways

- 5.26 The information submitted with the application has failed to demonstrate that access to and egress from the application site can be provided safely without endangering highway safety.

- 5.27 The application did not include an assessment of proposed sightlines including a speed survey over a 7 day period. Information in relation to existing traffic movements is also required along with an exercise to quantify the net change in traffic movements as a result of the proposals. It is noted that some of the allocated spaces for the dwellings are tandem in design, and therefore are not fully compliant with Interim Guidance Note 3 standards.

Other Matters

- 5.28 The agent has given two examples of what he considers to be two similar sites, both of which were allowed on appeal.
- 5.29 Wind Chimes, Chartway Street referenced 15/507493/OUT (outline planning for 9 houses) was allowed on appeal on 9th December 2016, as a five year land supply could not be demonstrated at the time of the appeal hearing. The Inspector also found that the site was reasonably accessible to Sutton Valence on foot and with bus services to Maidstone.
- 5.30 The Oaks, Maidstone Road, referenced 14/0830 (for the construction of 10 houses) was allowed on appeal on 13th April 2015, as the Inspector found that the site was reasonably accessible to Sutton Valence on foot and with bus services to Maidstone.
- 5.31 Both of the sites in question are within close proximity to a pavement, as well as being closer to Maidstone Urban Area. In addition, the Council can now demonstrate a five year land supply. Finally, the adopted Maidstone Local Plan and revised NPPF both encourage sustainable development with an emphasis on good design that responds positively to its local, natural setting and, where possible, enhances the character of the area. For these reasons, the two examples that have been given are not considered relevant to this current application.
- 5.32 The proposed development is CIL liable. The Council adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy on 25 October 2017 and began charging on all CIL liable applications approved on and from 1 October 2018. The actual amount of CIL can only be confirmed once all the relevant forms have been submitted and relevant details have been assessed and approved. Any relief claimed will be assessed at the time planning permission is granted or shortly after.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The principle of this development proposal is unacceptable due to its unsustainable location and in relation to the council record of housing delivery and the 5 year land supply there is no requirement for new housing in unsustainable locations.
- 6.2 The new dwellings would introduce inappropriate development into the area with a substantial increase in residential built forms on the open field behind the commercial building. The development would be visible from the wider vantage point created at the junction with Chartway Street due to the removal of the commercial property and would also be visible on public right of way KH531.
- 6.3 Plots 4 and 5, due to their siting would be at odds with each other, resulting in an awkward and overbearing relationship that would fail to provide an adequate standard of accommodation. With the lack of a noise report the application also fails to demonstrate that an adequate standard of accommodation would be provided with the proximity of the dwellings to the large commercial premises to the west of the application site. Finally, the lack of highways information has also failed to demonstrate that the development proposal would be acceptable on these terms. For these reasons, the application should be refused.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would result in the creation of an unsustainable form of housing development in the countryside with future occupiers reliant on private vehicle use to gain access to basic services and, as such, would be contrary to policies SS1 (Spatial strategy), DM17

2. The proposed development by reason of the size, design and siting of houses and substantial encroachment into adjoining open countryside will result in an unacceptable consolidation of existing sporadic development in the locality with the development appearing as incongruous and detrimental to the rural character and landscape quality of the area contrary to policies SP17 (Countryside), DM1 (Principles of good design), and DM30 (Design principles in the countryside) of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.
3. The application fails to demonstrate that the development would provide an adequate standard of residential accommodation for future occupiers in relation to outlook, privacy and including potential noise nuisance from nearby commercial uses and associated traffic contrary to policy DM1 (Principles of good design) of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.
4. The application has failed to demonstrate (including the absence of adequate information on visibility splays and traffic generation) that the development will not result in harm to highway safety and that the proposal will provide an adequate standard of access contrary policy DM1 of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 and the NPPF.

Case Officer: Jocelyn Miller