

## 21 March 2022 Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Committee

### Urgent Update

18 March 2022

#### Item 14 – Local Plan Review Requirements Leading to Submission

The below urgent update contains three parts;

#### 1. Background Document – Evidence Base – Maidstone Local Plan Review Habitats Regulations Assessment Reg 19. HRA Report Addendum.

The document ‘Maidstone Local Plan Review Habitats Regulations Assessment Reg. 19 HRA Report Addendum’ has been received and added to the Local Plan Review evidence base documents. This paper may therefore be accessed via the link provided within Section 8 ‘Background Papers’ of the report.

#### 2. Appendix 2 – Proposed Main Modifications to the Local Plan Review

Updates are provided by way of the highlighted text in respect of the policy amendments for Heathlands (page 5 of appendix 2/page 27 of agenda pack), Lidsing (page 9 of appendix 2/page 31 of agenda pack) and Invicta Barracks (page 12 of appendix 2/page 34 of agenda pack)

Heathlands -

Phase	Development	Indicative Complementary Infrastructure
Preliminaries	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>North East access into development site from A20</u></li><li>• <u>Utilities trunking</u></li><li>• <u>necessary relocations agreed</u></li><li>• <u>Community engagement established and ongoing strategy in place</u></li><li>• <u>Railway Station business case complete</u></li></ul>
<u>1 (By 2032)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>c750 homes</u></li><li>• <u>new Local Centre including employment offer appropriate to the early phase and location</u></li><li>• </li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>c35Ha open space</u></li><li>• <u>New/ improved waste water treatment works delivered &amp; cordon sanitaire &amp; Nutrient Neutrality Strategy agreed.</u></li><li>• <u>bus diversions from A20 into the site and connecting to Lenham and Charing</u></li><li>• <u>Railway Station development commenced (or enhanced bus offer programmed)</u></li><li>• <u>off-site A20 mitigations commenced</u></li><li>• <u>AONB-compliant structural planting to north of the site, including “feathering”</u></li><li>• <u>Completion of extraction of minerals from Burleigh Farm</u></li></ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Employment land allocated</u></li> <li>• <u>Local Centre complete, including linked employment and primary school provision</u></li> </ul>
2 (By 2037)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Min 1,400 total homes</u></li> <li>• <u>District Centre</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Railway Station complete (or enhanced bus offer operational)</u></li> <li>• <u>New District Centre complete including principal local service offer and medical facility.</u></li> <li>• <u>NW connection onto A20, including completion of “northern loop” including in/out for A20 bus route.</u></li> <li>• <u>Ancient woodland enhancement secured</u></li> <li>• <u>AONB-compliant structural planting to north of additional development, including “feathering”</u></li> <li>• <u>Significant employment offer commenced linked to the District Centre/public transport hub</u></li> <li>• <u>Secondary school requirement established &amp; land allocated</u></li> <li>• <u>Employment designations commenced</u></li> <li>• <u>Public Open Space to serve new homes</u></li> <li>• <u>Nutrient Neutrality mitigations delivered</u></li> </ul>
3 (By 2042)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>c2,500 units total</u></li> <li>• </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A town park</u></li> <li>• <u>Appropriate bus links to district centre and neighbouring villages</u></li> <li>• <u>Country Park delivered</u></li> <li>• <u>AONB-compliant structural planting to north of the site</u></li> <li>• <u>Public Open Space to serve new homes</u></li> <li>• <u>Nutrient Neutrality mitigations delivered</u></li> <li>• <u>Secondary education provision delivered as necessary</u></li> </ul>
4/5 (By 2047/ 2052)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>c5,000 units</u></li> <li>• <u>new Local Centre</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Local Centre including local employment offer and Primary education provision</u></li> <li>• <u>AONB-compliant structural planting</u></li> <li>• <u>Minerals extraction complete at Chapel Farm</u></li> <li>• <u>NW access opens for vehicles</u></li> <li>• <u>Public Open Space to serve new homes</u></li> </ul>

Lidsing -

<b>Phase</b>	<b>Development</b>	<b>Indicative Complementary Infrastructure</b>
Preliminaries	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Access routes into development site</u></li> <li>• <u>Utilities trunking</u></li> <li>• <u>Community engagement established and ongoing</u></li> </ul>
1 (From 2027)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>c500 units</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Bus diversion into the site</u></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Primary connections into the site, including Establish principle E-W connection through the site</u></li> <li>• <u>AONB-compliant structural planting to south of the site</u></li> <li>• <u>Employment designation allocated</u></li> <li>• <u>Open Space complementary to resi units</u></li> </ul>
2 (From 2032)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>c1,000 total units</u></li> <li>• <u>New Local Centre</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Ancient woodland enhancement secured</u></li> <li>• <u>Secondary school contribution received</u></li> <li>• <u>Capstone Valley N-S open space/ ped enhancement completed</u></li> <li>• <u>Open Space complementary to resi units</u></li> <li>• <u>Employment site commenced</u></li> </ul>
3 (By 2037)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Min 1,300 units total</u></li> <li>• <u>14Ha Employment land</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>M2J4 upgrade complete</u></li> <li>• <u>Mitigations to surrounding routes implemented</u></li> <li>• <u>M2J4 AONB mitigation complete</u></li> <li>• <u>3FE Primary complete</u></li> <li>• <u>Open Space complementary to resi units</u></li> <li>• <u>Orbital bus route operational</u></li> </ul>
4 (By 2042)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>c2,000 units</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Open Space complementary to resi units</u></li> </ul>

Invicta Barracks -

Phase	Development	Indicative Infrastructure Secured
1 (From 2027)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• c500 units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanism agreed for comprehensive redevelopment of the wider Invicta Barracks to deliver 1,300 new homes and appropriate education provision as required;</li> <li>• Timescales and phasing for withdrawal confirmed with MoD;</li> <li>• Ped/cycle connections to Town Centre</li> <li>• Open Space complementary to new homes;</li> <li>• Confirmation on reprovision of Hindu Temple;</li> <li>• Strategy for re-use of Park House and surrounding parkland/woodland agreed;</li> <li>• Biodiversity Plan agreed.</li> </ul>
2 (From 2032)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• c1,000 total units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central parkland enhancement completed;</li> <li>• A229 Junction improvements completed;</li> <li>• Off-site highway mitigations completed</li> <li>• New Local/ neighbourhood centre established;</li> <li>• Bus diversion into the site;</li> <li>• Secondary school requirement established &amp; land allocated;</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open Space complementary to new homes.</li> </ul>
3 (By 2037)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Min 1,300 units total</li> <li>• Local Centre (Done above with first 100?)</li> <li>• New through school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new education provision completed as appropriate;</li> <li>• Open Space complementary to new homes;</li> <li>• N-S Bus route operational.</li> </ul>

### 3. Background Document – Evidence Base – Consultation Statement

Within the evidence base documents, the document ‘Consultation Statement’ has been updated, in two ways.

Firstly, an additional section at the end of the Consultation Statement called ‘Other Comments’ has been inserted.

Secondly, the update reflects additional content resulting from the Regulation 19 representations made from CPRE Kent, including the representation concerning the Heathlands Garden Community proposal. For Councillors’ convenience, the updated text regarding the Heathlands Garden Community proposal is provided directly below, along with the other key comments made by CPRE all of which are highlighted in yellow.

The updated Consultation Statement may therefore be accessed via the link provided within Section 8 ‘Background Papers’ of the report.

General	Local Residents	Promised presentations to the public have been delayed BEYOND THE CLOSING DATE FOR COMMENTS. This is unconstitutional and unfair. It may even be illegal.	Consultation has been in line with Government regulations and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.
General	CPRE	Despite the Council adopting a master planner role early on for the proposal, serious concerns have been raised to CPRE Kent regarding the lack of community engagement from either the Council or Homes England as the development partner. We are advised that there has only been one single meeting between the Council and the local community since the projects inception and that key issues when raised have failed to be addressed. This is despite assurances that the community will be involved from the concept stage. It is CPRE Kents view that there is a legitimate expectation that ongoing consultation would occur, especially as it was explicitly stated from the start and the new garden community proposals are meant to be ‘community-led’.	

General	SOHL	NPPF Paragraph 26 requires effective and ongoing joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies. This has not been achieved, as set out in the earlier section.	The Council has engaged positively with all necessary Duty to Co-operate partners.
General	CPRE	A number of Duty to Co-operate partners raised significant concerns with respect to the Heathlands proposal at the Regulation 18b consultation stage. This included Ashford Borough Council for which a shares a housing market area with this proposal.	

General	Local Residents	According to the Council statement the vision for the Heathlands Garden Settlement is informed by an extensive range of technical reports but in fact only studies have been submitted. Studies, which are giving the impression that the site is relatively unconstrained in heritage, ecological and flood risk terms, which can't be further from the reality. There are a worrying number of caveats in the studies such as a 'subject to further detailed investigation and technical assessment'.	The Council has carried out due diligence to establish that the proposal is deliverable and viable. This is published in the evidence base to the LPR.
General	CPRE	The local plan strategy requires the Heathlands proposal to deliver approximately 5000 homes, 1,400 of which are intended to be within the plan period 2029-37 Paragraph 22 of the revised NPPF states that <i>"where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery"</i> . Consequently, and read against planning practice guidance, the Council are required to make a realistic assessment about the prospect of Heathlands being developed and commencing by 2029 and realistic assumptions as to delivery rates both within and beyond the plan period. To inform this, there needs to be sufficient detail as to infrastructure costs, viability, and realistic levels of contingency. However, as it stands, the information within Policy LPRSP4(A) does not even give certainty as to what infrastructure is required. We are told a new rail station is "to be explored"	

		<p>there is “potential connection” to a new M20 junction, there may either be an “improved” or a “new” waste water treatment plant. The supporting whole plan IDP is similarly vague with many critical costs TBC or subject to feasibility studies. It seems the intention is for the Council to secure the policy hook within the submission plan with much of the detail being relegated to a future SPD.</p> <p>CPRE Kent believe that this approach is wrong and that the Heathlands proposal needs to be demonstrably developable and deliverable within this submission plan if it is to be adopted as an allocation. The current uncertainty with respect to the necessary infrastructure means there is simply insufficient information for this assessment to be made at this time.</p> <p>Despite this and the potential impact of delays in securing as yet unknown infrastructure, it is sufficiently clear that trajectory is overly optimistic. For example and in terms of meeting the 2029 commencement date, the Development Project Delivery Plan makes no consideration for the securing of the SPD and potential delays this can easily entail. It also remains unclear as to whether all Landowners are signed up or whether CPO powers will be necessary. If it’s the later than clearly there remains potential for further delay. Should the development commence as intended, there is no local evidence that the local housing market would absorb the intended 150 units a year, not least with the Lenham Neighbourhood plan specifically agreed at 100 units a year on the basis this was the maximum the local market were deemed capable of absorbing.</p>	
General	Local Residents	Heathlands is not viable and is highly unlikely to attract the capital this scheme requires.	
General	Local Residents	The finances just simply do not add up and unlikely to attract the investment needed. If the development was properly invested in for example in infrastructure to support this scale of housing for example upgrading the A20 which is absolutely needed - cost outweighs benefit.	

1	Local Residents	Given the suggested timescale the first 1686 will be built before any infrastructure is completed, with no guarantee that that this will materialise.	Infrastructure will be delivered in a phased manner, alongside development. This will be in line with the Council's IDP.
5	CPRE	As set out above with respect to deliverability, we are extremely concerned as to the lack of clarity as to exactly what infrastructure is necessary to mitigate the impact of the proposal and what community benefits are likely to be secured. Until there is more certainty on this, we will reserve our position. We and others have raised particular with respect to the Lenham Waste Water Treatment Plant and are now extremely concerned the uncertainty generated by the potential Heathlands allocations is likely to delay the much needed refurbishments	
1	SOHL	The Heathlands garden settlement has not been co-ordinated with the plans of other major infrastructure providers which question the ability to deliver unlocking infrastructure to support the development: the evidence base to the LPR provides no confidence that the promoters of Heathlands have coordinated their plans with major infrastructure providers to deliver the required infrastructure.	
5	SOHL	Education provision. There appears to be inconsistency in the approach to providing new schools between the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the promoter's masterplan. The promoter makes no reference to a new secondary school however the IDP and the draft KCC SoCG includes a new secondary school. KCC's regulation 18b response insisted on 3 new primary schools with 7FE. The promoter and the IDP only include 2 6FE primary schools. There appears to be a clear lack of co-ordination between the promoter, the LPA and the education authority.	

3(f)	Local Resident	Garden villages should avoid potential coalescence with nearby settlements - yet many of Heathlands' "development areas" directly abut established homes at Lenham Heath. Being simply on the other side of a road to established dwellings is insufficient.	The Policy includes a requirement for the development to have an appropriate relationship with surrounding settlements.
3(f)	Charing PC	The settlements and landscape of Charing Heath and Lenham Heath flow seamlessly into each other. Therefore, what affects Lenham Heath also affects Charing Heath and Charing,	

		particularly in the context of the A20 corridor. This may be exacerbated if the duty of co-operations ignites a flow of urban ribbon development into Charing parish. This proposed development is therefore of great concern to Charing, but there is no indication that this has been considered.	
3(f)	CPRE	The development will lead to coalescence between Lenham, Charing Heath and Charing. In particular, development area extends very close to the footprint of Lenham Village leading to real and apparent coalescence with the village. More generally, this coalescence appearance of continual sporadic development along the entire length of the A20 from Harrietsham through to Charing, leading to an unacceptable impact upon the openness and setting of the AONB.	

6(e)	DHA obo Various	No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this would be a feasible or viable measure, however, and no evidence of support from Network Rail, Southeastern Rail or Kent County Council has been demonstrated. We believe that the Council should be modelling for the full 5,000 units as well as the full employment provision, and should also model both scenarios of the railway station being delivered, and it not. Failure to do so undermines any understanding of the impact of the development, and the necessary mitigation required to ensure that there is no severe impact upon the highway network.	KCC, as the highway authority recommended additional transport modelling be undertaken to include the full build out of the development. The strategic level modelling does not include the new train station facility to ensure the development is deliverable with mitigations using the existing available transport network. A letter of agreement to work with the council on developing the options for rail transport from the development has been provided by Network Rail. A feasibility study to develop the case of the new rail station has been now commissioned and Network Rail and the DfT need to be engaged in this process from the outset. This study will require assessment of the impact on potential closure of
General	CPRE	The sustainability appraisal found the Heathlands proposal performed least well across the range of sustainability objectives. It notes in part this is owing to its remote location (Para 4.55 of the SA). This is despite the sustainability appraisal of Heathlands taking the assumption that a new railway station would be provided. However, the letter from Network Rail dated 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2021 confirms is far from certain and only 1 of 4 potential options. Of significant concern is that one of these options would see the removal of the existing Lenham station making it the existing community significantly less sustainable. Similarly, Highways England	

		<p>have all but ruled out a new junction on to the M20 for the foreseeable future. The Heathlands proposal is in an isolated location remote from the main centres of employment. The Councils itself accepts that there are few local services and employment opportunities at present, though this may improve over time as the development grows. The problem with such an approach is that unsustainable travel patterns will be well established and difficult to break long before this occurs. It is CPRE Kents view that these details will be fundamental considerations for the examination. If a new railway station is not likely and, the sustainability appraisal should be updated to reflect this.</p> <p>Whilst we are already sufficiently concerned the proposal will have extremely high car-dependency even with a new train station, there simply could not be a claim to being a sustainably location if one is not provided.</p>	<p>existing infrastructure on transport patterns. The highway authority is also engaged on developing understanding of the implications on the surrounding transport network.</p>
6	CPRE	<p>The Heathlands Transport Vision undertaken by Vectors in support of the proposal confirms the likely significant local impact of the proposal by giving a best-case scenario that 80% of employment related trips will involve out commuting (page 10). This will be in-addition to the 100% of secondary education trips owing to the fact no secondary school is proposed. It also confirms that 83% of all trips within the area are currently undertaken by the private car, with just 1% by bike and 1% by bus. Whilst mitigation and interventions are proposed, the anticipated likely modal shifts as set out on page 47 of the Vectors Report are underwhelming. Overall, this suggests a relatively limited level of internalisation, though significant additional external trips. It is for these reasons that the proposal has performed so poorly with respect to the Climate Change objective within the Sustainability Appraisal. The Vectos Report confirms the majority of these external trips will continue to be by private vehicle which in turn sees increased traffic, congestion, and pollution within the locality and beyond.</p>	

7(a)	Local Residents	<p>The River Stour starts life at Bowley Lane (Lenham Heath) and meanders its way through the entire proposed development area. 'The Stour catchment is one of the most important for water dependant wildlife in the United Kingdom. The Stodmarsh water environment is internationally important for its wildlife and is protected under the Water Environment Regulations ( The Water Framework Directive - England &amp; Wales Regulations 2017) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (England &amp; Wales Regulations 2017 - as amended),, as well as national protection for many parts of the floodplain catchment (including Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981 as amended, Countryside &amp; Rights of Way Act 2000, Natural Environment &amp; Rural Communities Act 2006)'</p>	<p>The Council has carried out a HRA into the impacts of the Plan, and there are various provisions within the Policy to manage ecology and secure biodiversity net gain.</p>
7(a)	Local Residents	<p>Natural England commissioned a report (Advice on Nutrient Neutrality for New Development in the Stour Catchment in Relation to Stodmarsh Designated Sites .. July 2020), identifying how environmentally important the entire River Stour watercourse is from source to discharge and therefore, insisting on increased protection. This significant chalk stream river must be protected from all potential threats, such as large scale, new development in the countryside. With the increase of waste water being discharged into the Stour from the proposed development, this would lead to a significant increase in Nitrate and Phosphate levels. These have been proved to be considerably detrimental to the overall health of the river and the flora and fauna contained within and around it. This would certainly result in the loss of existing natural habitats.</p>	
7(a)	Local Residents	<p>Contamination will begin at the very start of construction, as the land is stripped bare. Runoff from the huge construction sites will introduce a rush of soil particles into the river, leading to an immediate deterioration in water quality downstream. Even this can cause serious harm to trout stocks, as inert materials like this can block their delicate gill structures, causing pain, distress &amp; possibly eventual death, leading to potential mass fish fatalities.</p>	
7(a)	Local Residents	<p>Once occupied, the additional 5,000 households will then produce a massive increase in sewage outfall. The treatment facility already located in the middle of the proposed development is</p>	

		already oversubscribed & is failing to meet agreed water quality output guidelines now.
7(a)	Local Residents	The proposed SUDS systems will introduce huge amounts of household detergents, bleach and runoff contaminants from motor vehicles into the aquifers underground in the river catchment area & this will add a third layer of contamination in the form of diffuse pollution to the river itself.
7(a)	Local Residents	Natural England's paper on nutrient neutrality has been referenced within the report and paragraph 7.166 states <i>it is necessary for new development to demonstrate that it can achieve net nutrient neutrality in the Stour catchment</i> . The only mitigation measures proposed for the Heathlands site is stated in Policy LPRSP4(A) – a new country park around the river Stour will include a wetland area to assist with infiltration of nitrates and phosphates arising within the upper Stour catchment. No details have been provided or appropriate assessment undertaken to determine whether nutrient neutrality for a development of this size in this location is actually achievable. The inclusion of the Heathlands development therefore leaves a significant risk to the housing delivery targets if, upon further investigation, the mitigation measures are not physically possible. The costs of installation and maintenance of a nutrient neutrality system are not presented. This therefore supports the use of alternative locations for significant development away from the River Stour catchment.
7(c)	Local Residents	The irreversible damage to our wildlife . Kent is the garden of England has been given this long standing for this through out the world , Have you hand on your hearts forgotten this ?
7(c)	CPRE	The Magic map by Defra identifies pockets of rare acid grassland in Lenham Heath and other priority habitats spread out over the whole area. It will be in our opinion impossible to safeugard these habitats and still allow for a compact form of a new settlement.
7(c)	Local Residents	If you continue to rubber stamp this number of houses on prime wildlife land you will forever be remembered by your votes for generations for making the tragic decision of destroying our heritage , our lives from pollution and killing animals natural habitat .
7(c)	Local Residents	<b>National policy</b> sets out that planning should provide biodiversity net gains where possible. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

		<p>Paragraphs 170(d), 174(b) and 175(d) refer to this policy requirement and the Natural Environment Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further explanation on how this should be done.</p> <p>Delivering net gain is also referred to in the National Infrastructure Commission's Design Principles, National Policy Statements and the National design guide.</p>	
--	--	--	--

7(e)	Local Residents	<p>An Oxford Archaeology report suggests finds include Iron age coins, a broach and Roman coins just 200m East of Chapel Farm.</p> <p>The Lenham Archaeological Society have been aware of the importance of the field that constitutes the eastern half of Site 76 for many years. As a result there is a wealth of published literature on the many important remains and artefacts that have been discovered on the site and its relevance to local history and pre-history.</p> <p>The proposed site is steeped in archaeological finds such as Hut Circles, Iron Age Villages, Roman Coins, as well as being the site of Royton Chapel (1256 AD)</p>	The Council considers that there is sufficient scope in the policy to ensure that heritage archaeological significance will be responded to.
7(e)	Local Residents	<p>Crabbe Farm: The house is a Kentish Farmhouse built about 1650 so it is nearly 400 years old. All that time it has sat surrounded by its farmland in a beautiful setting as befits its heritage. Like previous owners I have ensured the house is properly maintained in accordance with its Grade II listing so that its heritage will be enjoyed by future generations. This proper sense of history is so important. Should Maidstone Borough Council have its way, all that will be lost, and the property will be surrounded by suburban houses right up to its boundary and its heritage lost. Surely this property and its heritage must be properly preserved and not wiped away by inappropriate development.</p>	
7€	NoSt Landowner	<p>Quoting Stantec: "There are a significant number of dwellings(140) located across the site which will make deliverability challenging..... added to this there are historic farmsteads and listed buildings" making deliverability challenging.</p>	
7€	CPRE	<p>We share the concerns raised by Historic England as to the potential harm to heritage assets which have known significances, or have potential to become significant in the case of</p>	

		<p>archaeology. This includes a number of listed buildings throughout the site, including Grade II* Royston Manor and Chilston Park, a grade II Registered Park and Garden. We are also extremely concerned as to the potential harm upon the Lenham Conservation Area and listed buildings within, not least as a consequence to the significant increase of vehicle movements likely to occur within the village.</p> <p>With respect to archaeology, Heathlands contains known significant buried and visible archaeology and has the potential to contain significant as yet unknown archaeology. Of particular note is the site of Chapel Farm which seems to be an Iron Age, Roman and Medieval settlement of considerable regional if not national importance.</p>	
--	--	---	--

SP4(a)	DHA obo Countryside	<p>No planning permission exists for the infilling of Lenham Quarry.</p> <p>for 3.2 million tonnes of soft sand extraction, planned for the next 25 years.</p> <p>Phase 4 of the development amounts to 1,350 dwellings comprising which follows the previous three phases (2,800 combined). Based on fist completions occurring in 2029 and the proposed delivery rate, this would mean residential completions occurring within phase 4 in 2048. However, Chapel farm is not expected to have commenced extraction until 202728. The site is not expected to ceased operation until 2050.</p> <p>Post extraction, Chapel Farm is proposed to be restored to low level acid grassland and heathland habitat and as such it is not proposed to fill the void created by the mineral extraction. No allowance appears to have been made within the 'Local Plan Review Viability Assessment &amp; CIL Review' (Aspinall Verdi, 2021) for the significant costs associated with infilling this void space and remediating the site.</p>	Phasing will need to have regard to the extraction of minerals on the site.
SP4(a)	CPRE	Some of the area is safeguarded in the Kent Mineral Plan which is affected by the Chapel Farm allocation for soft sand in the recently adopted Kent Minerals Sites Plan, 2020. The	

		Heathlands site is also in close proximity to a number of active mineral sites at Shepherds Farm and Burleigh Farm. Development of the strategic allocation proposed will need to ensure that the mineral reserves allocated in the Kent Minerals Sites Plan 2020 and the safeguarded reserves of other permitted mineral sites in the vicinity are not sterilised.. This again raises significant issues with respect to deliverability and phasing.	
SP4(a)	DHA obo Countryside	A new wwtw is proposed. Given that the provision of significant additional infrastructure is need at the very early stages of development and the financial impact on the development we are surprised that no specific consideration has been given to the costs of these measures within the viability assessment undertaken by the Council.	Heathlands will be nutrient neutral.
SP4(a)	CPRE	The Nutrient neutrality issue at Stodmarsh is a substantial constraint on the Heathland proposal. Whilst we will consider the views of Natural England and KCC on this matter as they emerge, the fact this is the only Garden settlement option facing this significant and serious issue reiterates CPRE Kent view as to why the Heathlands proposal is such a poor choice	

LPRSP4(A)	Natural England	<p>Due to the scale of this allocation and the existing local landscape character, Natural England has concerns regarding the impact of this allocation on the setting of the Kent Downs AONB. The Sustainability Appraisal states that the delivery of this allocation would be likely to have an adverse effect on the Kent Downs AONB through impacts to its setting and that the proposal is located in an area that has high landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>A landscape capacity and sensitivity study should be undertaken. The findings of this study should provide information on the significance of landscape and visual effects, particularly with regards to the extent and nature of development which can be accommodated within this site. It is difficult to see how a development could proceed at present, given the requirements that developments should not have a significant</p>	The Council will work with the Kent Downs AONB Unit to understand, minimise, and appropriately mitigate where possible impacts on the AONB and its setting.
-----------	-----------------	---	---

		adverse impact on the setting of the Kent Downs AONB, as per Policy LPRSP9.	
LPRSP4(a)	CPRE	<p>Notwithstanding CPRE Kent, the Kent Downs AONB unit and others raising significant concern at the Regulation 18b stage that the proposal will impact upon the setting of the AONB, it is now the case that the proposed development has been brought forward in a manner that will clearly exacerbate this impact.</p> <p>In particular, the Kent Downs Unit previously stated they:</p> <p><i>“object in the strongest terms to land north of the railway being included for strategic scale growth. This land forms part of the immediate setting of the Kent Downs and the proximity and inter-visibility of it to the AONB is such that it would not be possible to satisfactorily mitigate the scale of development that is being proposed.”</i></p> <p>By increasing the extent of development which is north of the railway line, it is clear the Council is disregarding the AONB units concerns for which CPRE Kent share. It remains our view the proposal will impact upon the AONB for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The scale and massing of 5000 new homes within close proximity of the AONB will undoubtedly impact on the views out of the AONB.</li> <li>- The proximity will lead to a loss of tranquillity through the introduction or increase of lighting, noise, and traffic movements.</li> <li>- Linked to this, there will be significantly increased traffic flows to and from the AONB, resulting in erosion of the character of rural roads and lanes;</li> <li>- And finally there will undoubtedly be increased recreational pressure as a result of the close proximity to the AONB</li> </ul>	

LPRSP4(a)	Montagu Evans obo Quinn	the site sits between an existing railway line and road which will inhibit the creation of a coherent place and will require expensive and potentially unsightly grade-separated crossings (particularly given that Network Rail	The Council considers that Heathlands presents a sustainable location for growth, when compared with reasonable alternatives,
-----------	-------------------------	--	---

		generally does not support new level crossings);	and has the potential to meet many of these criteria.
LPRSP4(a)	CPRE	<p>The Agricultural Land Classification Technical Note within the evidence base confirms the Heathlands site is likely to comprise areas of the “best and most versatile” Grades 1, 2 and 3a land, together with areas of lower quality Subgrade 3b land on the heavier soils where wetness is a limitation.</p> <p>The Councils Agricultural Land assessment supplementary paper confirms that this amounts to 16 HA of Grade 1, 109.64 HA of Grade 2 a, 419 HA of Grade 3 or 3a and 15.50 HA of Grade 3b.</p> <p>Specifically with respect to Grade 1, what will be lost at Heathlands amounts to 2.62 % of all Grade 1 land across the Borough and accounts for 100% of the Grade 1 land that is to be lost as a consequence of this plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The NPPF also adds that plans should; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework. Further guidance is provided at footnote 58 of page 50 of the NPPF which states that “where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality”.</p> <p>CPRE Kent consider selection of the Heathlands proposal over and above reasonable alternatives of lower quality soils is a failure to genuinely consider alternative growth scenarios that would not lead to significant loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, including grade 1 land that is of the highest quality nationally.</p>	
LPRSP4(a)	Montagu Evans obo Quinn	it is Grade 1 agricultural land	