

<b>MA/07/2092 Kent International Gateway</b>		
<b>Reasons for Refusal</b>		
<b>Original</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p>1. The proposal is contrary to the SRA criteria for the location of SRFI and Policy T13 of the draft South East Plan, Policy TP23 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan, and the guidance contained in PPG4 and PPG13 in that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not well related to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed markets</li> <li>- London</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Where the key rail and road radials intersect with the M25.</li> <li>• It will not result in a significant modal shift of freight from road to rail, or reduce onward lorry movements,</li> <li>• It is located adjacent to incompatible residential uses,</li> <li>• The site is not previously developed land and the proposal conflicts with countryside and AONB policies.</li> <li>• The site is not needed to meet SRA and Government policy for the provision of SRFI in London and the wider South East.</li> </ul>	<p>1. The proposal is contrary to the SRA criteria for the location of SRFI and Policy T13 of the South East Plan 2009, and the guidance contained in PPG4 and PPG13 in that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not well related to:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed markets</li> <li>- London</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Where the key rail and road radials intersect with the M25</li> <li>• It will not result in a significant modal shift of freight from road to rail, or reduce onward lorry movements,</li> <li>• It is located adjacent to incompatible residential uses,</li> <li>• The site is not previously developed land and the proposal conflicts with countryside and AONB policies.</li> <li>• The site is not needed to meet SRA and Government policy for the provision of SRFI in London and the wider South East.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Amended to take into account the loss of the Structure Plan and adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>2. There are suitable sites elsewhere</p>	<p>2. There are suitable sites elsewhere that can</p>	<p>2. Amended to take</p>

<p>that can (a) meet policy requirements for the provision of 3 to 4 SRFI sites to serve London and the wider South East, and (b) that that satisfy the policy criteria guiding the location of SRFI sites located in the region; set out in draft South East Plan Policy T13, and the SRA's SRFI Policy (2004), as endorsed by Government.</p>	<p>(a) meet policy requirements for the provision of 3 to 4 SRFI sites to serve London and the wider South East, and (b) that satisfy the policy criteria guiding the location of SRFI sites located in the region; set out in Policy T13 of the South East Plan 2009, and the SRA's SRFI Policy (2004), as endorsed by Government.</p>	<p>into account the loss of the Structure Plan and adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>3. The Applicant proposes to erect in the open countryside 373,746 sq.m. of warehousing and other commercial floorspace, at a location not identified as priority for economic growth, contrary to Policies SP1, KTG2, EKA1, EKA4, EKA5 and AOSR7 of the draft South East Plan, and Policy TP23 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan. No justification for the development has been made to outweigh policies directing economic development elsewhere and the strategy for urban regeneration in the South East region.</p>	<p>3. The Applicant proposes to erect in the open countryside 300,592 sq.m. of warehousing and other commercial floorspace, at a location not identified as priority for economic growth, contrary to Policies SP1, KTG2, EKA1, EKA4, EKA5 and AOSR7 of the South East Plan 2009. No justification for the development has been made to outweigh policies directing economic development elsewhere and the strategy for urban regeneration in the South East region.</p>	<p>3. Amended to take into account the loss of the Structure Plan and adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>4. The proposal is located on a greenfield site at the foot of the Kent Downs Area Of Natural Beauty (AONB), within a Special Landscape Area (SLA), in the open countryside and within a designated Strategic Gap. The proposal will introduce a</p>	<p>4.The proposal is located on a greenfield site at the foot of the Kent Downs Area Of Natural Beauty (AONB), within a Special Landscape Area (SLA), in the open countryside and within a designated Strategic Gap. The proposal will introduce a built development of an obtrusive scale and form, on to an undulating and highly</p>	<p>4. Amended to take into account the loss of the Structure Plan and adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>

<p>built development of an obtrusive scale and form, on to an undulating and highly constrained site in a valued landscape, including mitigation measures that are unsympathetic to the landscape and surroundings. The proposed development will cause serious harm by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adversely affecting the strategy for the management of the urban form, countryside and land,</li> <li>• The development of fresh land in the countryside,</li> <li>• The physical destruction of key characteristics of the site, including its topography, drainage and vegetation and therefore the character of the landscape in a designated SLA and the foreground setting to the AONB</li> <li>• The erosion of the designated area of Strategic Gap, contributing to inappropriate coalescence of settlements and creating urban sprawl,</li> <li>• Visual intrusion in the landscape including significant visual harm to the setting of the AONB and heritage features, and</li> <li>• Conflict with the aim of enhancing the quality of the</li> </ul>	<p>constrained site in a valued landscape, including mitigation measures that are unsympathetic to the landscape and surroundings. The proposed development will cause serious harm by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adversely affecting the strategy for the management of the urban form, countryside and land,</li> <li>• The development of fresh land in the countryside,</li> <li>• The physical destruction of key characteristics of the site, including its topography, drainage and vegetation and therefore the character of the landscape in a designated SLA and the foreground setting to the AONB</li> <li>• The erosion of the designated area of Strategic Gap, contributing to inappropriate coalescence of settlements and creating urban sprawl,</li> <li>• Visual intrusion in the landscape including significant visual harm to the setting of the AONB and heritage features, and</li> <li>• Conflict with the aim of enhancing the quality of the landscape on the primary transport routes and the key strategic approaches to Maidstone town,</li> <li>• Reduce the enjoyment of numerous Public Rights of Way including the Pilgrim’s Way and the North Downs Way,</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

<p>landscape on the primary transport routes and the key strategic approaches to Maidstone town,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the enjoyment of numerous Public Rights of Way including the Pilgrim’s Way and the North Downs Way,</li> </ul> <p>and therefore the proposal will significantly damage the countryside contrary to Policies CC6, C3, C4 and AOSR7 of the draft South East Plan, Policies EN1, 3, 4, 5, 13 and QL1 and 9 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan, ENV21 and ENV28, 31 and 34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan and the guidance contained in PPS7 and the SRA Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy. No justification has been made to outweigh the policies and guidance that seeks to protect the countryside, the AONB and SLA, and to prevent urban sprawl.</p>	<p>and therefore the proposal will significantly damage the countryside contrary to Policies CC6, C3, C4 and AOSR7 of the South East Plan 2009, Policies ENV21 and ENV28, ENV31 and ENV34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, guidance contained in PPS7 and the SRA Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy.</p> <p>No justification has been made to outweigh the policies and guidance that seeks to protect the countryside, the AONB and SLA, and to prevent urban sprawl.</p>	
<p>5. The proposal will result in the provision of employment in a location where there is an insufficient supply of labour locally. This will seriously impact on local businesses and will result in considerable inward commuting to an area that is not readily serviced by public transport.</p>	<p>5. The proposal will result in the provision of employment in a location where there is an insufficient supply of labour locally. This will result in considerable inward commuting to an area that is not readily serviced by public transport. This will result in increased car journeys, contrary to Policies T1, SP1, SP2, RE3 and AOSR7 of the South East Plan 2009</p>	<p>5. Amended to take into account the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Also, the words ‘will seriously impact on local</p>

<p>This will result in increased car journeys, contrary to the advice contained in PPG13 and EP3 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan and Policies T1, SP1, SP2, RE3 and AOSR7 of the draft South East Plan.</p>	<p>and the guidance contained in PPG13.</p>	<p>businesses' are deleted as this part of the reason has been overcome.</p>
<p>6. The proposal will result in the creation of a major new centre of employment to the east of Maidstone, and would be in addition to the established policy for the provision of quality jobs in the town centre and elsewhere within the urban area. This will remove the ability of existing Plans and the Local Development Framework to determine the type of employment that should be provided and where it should take place. If the development were to take place, it would have a significant impact on the level and location of employment and consequently the scale of housing to be provided in the draft Core Strategy. It is therefore contrary to Policies SP2 and AOSR7 of the draft South East Plan and Policies EP2 and EP4 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan, and Policies ED1 and ED2 of the MBWLP.</p>	<p>6. A decision to locate an SRFI on this site is premature in advance of National and Regional Guidance identifying the broad location of sites for SRFI. Additionally the proposal, which will result in the creation of a major centre of employment to the east of Maidstone, contrary to policies ED1, ED2 and ED3 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, would be so substantial and its cumulative effects so significant that granting permission would prejudice the Core Strategy process, by predetermining decisions about the scale, location and phasing of new development which should be taken in the context of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>6. Amended to take into account the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy, also, that the proposal is premature in advance of the National Policy Statement and Regional Guidance.</p>
<p>7. The development and the use of the site for 24 hours a day, 7 days a</p>	<p>7. The construction of the development, and its subsequent use as an SRFI for 24 hours a day, 7</p>	<p>7. Amended to take into account the loss of the</p>

<p>week, will result in levels of noise which will cause complaint, nuisance and harm to the amenities of nearby residential properties and is therefore unacceptable and contrary to Policy CC6 of the draft South East Plan and Policies N5 and N6 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan and the guidance contained in PPG24. In addition, the Applicant has failed to undertake appropriate BS4142 assessments of the impact of industrial noise generated by the operations on the site upon residential areas to the south and west. This will cause significant complaint, nuisance and harm to the amenity of occupiers.</p>	<p>days a week, will result in levels of noise which will cause complaint, nuisance and harm to the amenities of nearby properties and is therefore unacceptable and contrary to Policy CC6 and NRM10 of the South East Plan 2009.</p>	<p>Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>There is the potential that subject to appropriately designed noise mitigation measures, this reason for refusal could be overcome through the imposition of appropriate conditions and within the S106 Agreement.</p>
<p>8. The development and use of the site for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, would by reason of the likely number of luminaires together with the lack of information regarding their siting, shielding and orientation be likely to result in a level of lighting that would have a highly damaging urbanising impact and adverse effect on the character of the countryside and the setting of the AONB, as well as affect residential amenity contrary to the advice in the Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light (GN01)</p>	<p>8. The development and use of the site for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, would by reason of the likely number of luminaires have a highly damaging urbanising impact and adverse effect on the character of the countryside and the setting of the AONB, contrary to the advice in the Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light (GN01) published by the Institute of Lighting Engineers (ILE2005) and Policy ENV49(4) of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000.</p>	<p>8. Amended to take into account the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>The Appellant has supplied additional information to enable the proper consideration of the lighting scheme, and to show that the proposal will not have an adverse effect</p>

<p>published by the Institute of Lighting Engineers (ILE2005), Kent and Medway Structure Plan Policies QL1 and NR5, and policy ENV49 of the Maidstone Borough-wide Local Plan 2000.</p>		<p>on residential amenity. It is therefore necessary to amend the wording as proposed.</p>
<p>9. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development does not have significant impact on air quality, including within Air Quality Management Areas. In the absence of this assessment the development would be contrary to Policies NR5, 6 and 7 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan.</p>	<p>9. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development does not have significant impact on air quality, including within Air Quality Management Areas. In the absence of this assessment the development would be contrary to Policies NRM9 of the South East Plan 2009.</p>	<p>9. This reason for refusal was based on the absence of information. This information has now been supplied and considered, which shows that the KIG proposal has a minor adverse effect on the Town Centre and adjoining area. It is therefore considered that in the light of the additional information, this reason for refusal should not be pursued.</p>
<p>10. The proposal would result in the removal of over 4 hectares of woodland, an additional 55 trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders and hedgerows of important historic value and diversity; removing the contribution they make to the landscape and ecology. Additionally, any protected trees retained will be</p>	<p>10. The proposal would result in the removal of 2 hectares of woodland, an additional 48 trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders and hedgerows of important historic value; removing the contribution they make to the landscape.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposal will result in harm to the character and amenity of the countryside,</p>	<p>11. This reason has been amended as a result of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Additionally, this reason has been amended as a result of the amendments</p>

<p>dominated by the built development and consequently, their protection in the future will be compromised. Therefore, the proposal will result in harm to the character and amenity of the countryside, contrary to Policy NRM4 of the draft South East Plan, Policy EN9 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan and the guidance contained in PPS9 and ENV21 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan.</p>	<p>contrary to Policy NRM7 of the South East Plan 2009, Policy ENV21 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000 and the guidance contained in PPS9.</p>	<p>to the scheme.</p>
<p>11.The proposal, because of its scale and physical and visual impact, would severely harm the setting and the future viability of a number of listed buildings including Barty Farm Barn and Woodcut Farm which are situated close to the site boundaries, contrary to Policy QL8 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, Policy BE7 of the draft South East Plan and advice given in PPG15. In addition, there would be an adverse impact on the settings of the Bearsted Green and Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Areas by reason of visual impact, noise and lighting, contrary to Policy QL6 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, Policy BE7 of the draft South East Plan and advice given in PPG15. In addition, the scale and nature of the proposals</p>	<p>11. The proposal, because of its scale and physical and visual impact, would severely harm the setting and the future viability of listed buildings at Barty Farm Barn and Woodcut Farm which are situated close to the site boundaries, contrary to Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and guidance contained in PPG15. In addition, there would be an adverse impact on the settings of the Bearsted Green and Bearsted Holy Cross Conservation Areas by reason of visual impact and lighting, contrary to Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and guidance contained in PPG15. In addition, the scale and nature of the proposals would result in a seriously adverse effect on the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Thurnham Castle, contrary to Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and advice contained in PPG16.</p>	<p>12. Amended as a result of the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Additionally, the amended proposal has reduced the number of buildings adversely affected. It is therefore necessary to amend the wording as proposed.</p>

<p>would result in a seriously adverse effect on the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Thurnham Castle, contrary to Policy QL7 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, Policy BE7 of the draft South East Plan and advice given in PPG16.</p>		
<p>12.The site lies in an area of proven archaeological potential and, in the absence of any detailed archaeological assessment, including fieldwork, to enable the impact of the development upon archaeological remains to be adequately judged, the proposals must be considered to be unacceptable. Determination of the application in advance of the provision of this information would be contrary Policies QL7 and QL9 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, Policy BE7 of the draft South East Plan and advice given in PPG16.</p>	<p>12. The site lies in an area of proven archaeological potential and, in the absence of any detailed archaeological assessment, including fieldwork, to enable the impact of the development upon archaeological remains to be adequately judged, the proposals must be considered to be unacceptable. Determination of the application in advance of the provision of this information would be contrary to Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and the guidance contained in PPG16.</p>	<p>13. Amended as a result of the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>13.The proposal will result in a significant loss of important wildlife habitats that cannot be replaced or compensated for under the current proposals. This acknowledged significant loss of habitat area and habitat connectivity for notable species make the development unacceptable in the form proposed,</p>	<p>13.The proposal will result in a significant loss, disturbance and fragmentation of important habitats for species that are protected by law and of principal importance for biodiversity conservation. These impacts cannot be mitigated or compensated for under the current proposals. These acknowledged significant impacts on wildlife make the development unacceptable in the form proposed, and contrary to the</p>	<p>14. Amended as a result of the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy and to take into account the disturbance and fragmentation of habitats.</p>

<p>and contrary to the provisions of Policy EN8 and EN9 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, Policy NRM4 of the draft South East Plan and the guidance contained in PPS9 and Circular 06/2005.</p>	<p>provisions of wildlife legislation, Policy NRM5 of the South East Plan, and the guidance contained in PPS9 and ODPM Circular 06/2005.</p>	
<p>14. Furthermore, a significant amount of ecological survey information remains outstanding without which a sound assessment of the full ecological impacts cannot be made. If this proposal was to go ahead, there is a risk that unknown significant impacts could occur to a range of habitats (including water courses) and species therein. Approval of the application in the absence of the necessary information is unacceptable and contrary to the provisions of Policy EN8 and EN9 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, Policy NRM4 of the draft South East Plan and the guidance contained in PPS9 and Circular 06/2005. The information required is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. White-clawed crayfish surveys downstream of the site (e.g. River Len).</li> <li>b. Additional bat surveys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harp netting and/or detailed activity surveys of The Belt</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>14. Furthermore, a significant amount of adequate ecological survey information remains outstanding, without which a sound assessment of the full ecological impacts cannot be made. If this proposal was to go ahead, there is a risk that unknown significant impacts could occur to a range of protected species, notably bats and reptiles. Approval of the application in the absence of the necessary information is unacceptable and contrary to PPS9 and ODPM Circular 06/2005.</p> <p>The information required is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Additional bat surveys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed activity surveys of The Belt woodland</li> <li>• Hibernation survey in Glenrowan House and End Cottage</li> <li>• Internal inspection and/or emergence survey of 'Chestnuts'.</li> <li>• Tree roost potential survey in Common Wood.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>15. Amended as a result of the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Additionally, this reason for refusal primarily related to the inability to make a sound assessment of the scheme in the absence of ecological information. The Appellant has supplied information in relation to some of the species originally identified, which makes it possible to determine the impact. The Environment Agency and Natural England are now satisfied as to the level of the information received in relation to some of the species. However, sufficient information has</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• woodland</li> <li>• Hibernation survey in Building 1 and 5</li> <li>• Full survey of Building 10</li> <li>• Tree roost potential survey in Common Wood.</li> </ul> <p>c. Aquatic Invertebrate surveys within site and downstream (recommended three visits to each water body).</p> <p>d. Detailed saproxylic terrestrial invertebrate surveys of woodland habitats, particularly in The Belt, and mature isolated trees.</p> <p>e. Drawings showing the location of sampling for invertebrates across the site, and the locations of notable species found.</p> <p>f. Fish surveys downstream of site.</p> <p>g. Adder surveys, ideally during emergence (from hibernation) period.</p> <p>h. Reptile surveys of woodland margins, pond margins, watercourse margins, and a sample of hedgerows across the site. Reptile surveys should extend to at least 15 suitable visits if presence is</p>	<p>b. Reptile surveys, of woodland margins, pond margins, watercourse margins, and a sample of hedgerows across the site. Reptile surveys should extend to at least 15 suitable visits if presence is confirmed (with each survey area). Adder surveys should be carried out during the emergence (from hibernation) period.</p> <p>c. Reptile and amphibian surveys of any proposed off-site receptor habitats to be used for mitigation or compensation of on-site impacts to these species groups.</p>	<p>not been provided to properly examine the impact of the scheme on the species still identified in the amended reason for refusal.</p>
--	---	--

<p>confirmed (with each survey area).</p> <p>i. Further dormouse surveys using a higher density of tubes/boxes in the woodland areas, and/or a longer period of survey.</p>		
<p>15. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact on groundwater and groundwater quality or result in unacceptable additional risk of flooding in the area. To permit the development in the absence of this information would be contrary to the provisions of policies NR8 and NR10 of the Kent &amp; Medway Structure Plan 2006 and the advice in PPS25.</p>	<p>15. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact on groundwater and groundwater quality or result in unacceptable additional risk of flooding in the area. To permit the development in the absence of this information would be contrary to the provisions of Policies NRM1, NRM2 and NRM4 of the South East Plan 2009 and the guidance contained in PPS25.</p>	<p>15. Amended as a result of the loss of the Structure Plan and the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>Additionally, the Appellant has now supplied additional information to overcome the concerns of the Environment Agency and Southern Water and it is considered that these issues can now be governed by Condition.</p>
<p>16. The level of traffic generated by the development in addition to the projected traffic flows of future growth allocated to the Borough by the draft South East Plan would have an adverse impact on the highway network and cannot be managed or mitigated. The local authorities consider that this would threaten delivery of the draft South East Plan targets and is therefore contrary to the guidance in PPS12 and PPS1, and</p>	<p>16. The level of traffic generated by the development in addition to the projected traffic flows of future growth allocated to the Borough by the South East Plan 2009 would have an adverse impact on the highway network and cannot be managed or mitigated. The local authorities consider that this would threaten delivery of the South East Plan 2009 targets and is therefore contrary to Policies CC7 and T1 of the South East Plan 2009 and the guidance contained in PPS1 and PPS12.</p>	<p>16. Amended to take into account the adoption of the South East Plan.</p>

<p>Policies T1 and CC7 of the draft South East Plan.</p>		
<p>17.The threat of terrorism in relation to transport links has been assessed as 'severe' and it is considered that this threat will face the UK for a generation to come. In the light of these assessments, it is considered that the provision of this facility immediately adjacent to International, National and Local Transport routes and the adjacent land uses is inappropriate and that for security reasons it is not considered a suitable location for this use, contrary to Policies SP1 and QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, and the advice in PPS1 and Safer Places: the Planning System and Crime Prevention (2004) and S17 of the Crime and Disorder Act.</p>	<p>17. The threat of terrorism in relation to transport links has been assessed as 'severe' and it is considered that this threat will face the UK for a generation to come. In the light of these assessments, it is considered that the provision of this facility immediately adjacent to International, National and Local Transport routes and the adjacent land uses is inappropriate and that for security reasons it is not considered a suitable location for this use, contrary to the guidance contained in PPS1 and Safer Places: the Planning System and Crime Prevention (2004) and S17 of the Crime and Disorder Act.</p>	<p>17. This will be updated at the Planning Committee meeting on 10 September 2009.</p>
<p>18.Insufficient information has been submitted by the Applicant to determine how the potential threat of terrorism and crime will be mitigated within this development and the effect the mitigation measures will have on the design of the proposal and the ability of the Applicant to implement the permission if it were granted, and consequently the overall impact of the</p>	<p>18. Insufficient information has been submitted by the Applicant to determine how the potential threat of terrorism and crime will be mitigated within this development and the effect the mitigation measures will have on the design of the proposal and the ability of the Applicant to implement the permission if it were granted, and consequently the overall impact of the development, contrary to Policy ENV21 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local</p>	<p>18. Amended as a result of the loss of the Structure Plan. If the matters identified in this reason can be controlled by Condition, it is recommended that this reason should not be pursued.</p>

<p>development, contrary to Policies SP1 and QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan 2006, PPG13 and the advice in PPS1 and Safer Places: the Planning System and Crime Prevention (2004) and S17 of the Crime and Disorder Act and Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan Policy ENV21.</p>	<p>Plan 2000, the guidance contained in PPS1, PPG13 and Safer Places: the Planning System and Crime Prevention (2004) and S17 of the Crime and Disorder Act.</p>	
---	--	--