

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning, Transport and Development Overview & Scrutiny Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 28 JANUARY 2015 ADJOURNED FROM 20 JANUARY 2015

Present: Councillor Springett (Chairman), and
Councillors Ash, Chittenden, English, Mrs Gooch,
Hogg, Powell, Round and de Wiggondene

Also Present: Councillors Mrs Blackmore, Burton,
Daley, Edwards-Daem, Greer,
D Mortimer, Newton, Perry, Mrs Ring,
Sams, Mrs Stockell, Thick and
Mrs Wilson

142. MINUTES SILENCE

The Committee held a minute silence to show respect for Councillor Peter Parvin, who represented Leeds Ward for 20 years and passed away on the evening of 27 January 2015.

143. THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHETHER ALL ITEMS ON THE AGENDA SHOULD BE WEBCAST

RESOLVED: That all items on the agenda be webcast.

144. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors:

- Ross;
- De Wiggondene;
- Willis, and;
- Munford.

145. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

- Councillor Hogg was substituting for Councillor Ross;
- Councillor Ash was substituting for Councillor de Wiggondene;
- Councillor Wilson was substituting for Councillor Willis, and;
- Councillor Gooch was substituting for Councillor Munford.

146. NOTIFICATION OF VISITING MEMBERS

Councillors Daley, Edwards-Daem, D Mortimer, Perry, Sams, Mrs Stockell and Thick were in attendance to address the committee on Item 8.

Councillors Blackmore, Burton, Greer, Newton and Ring were in attendance for Item 8 and reserved their right to address the Committee.

147. DISCLOSURES BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillor Springett declared an 'Other Significant Interest' by virtue of the fact that her property borders the boundary of site H1 (17) – Barty Farm, Bearsted.

Councillor Burton declared a Disclosable Pecuniary interest in site H1 (10) – Land South of Sutton Road, Langley.

Both councillors were to leave the room during discussion of these sites.

There were no disclosures by Officers.

148. TO CONSIDER WHETHER ANY ITEMS SHOULD BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBLE DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION

RESOLVED: That the items on the agenda be taken in public as proposed.

149. LOCAL PLAN EMPLOYMENT AND MIXED USE LAND ALLOCATIONS AND RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (AGENDA ITEM 9 FOR THE MEETING OF 20 JANUARY 2015)

The Committee considered the two options for the joint meeting with the Economic and Commercial Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ECD OSC) to consider together the Local Plan Employment and Mixed Use Land Allocations and the results of the public consultation of the Economic and Commercial Development Strategy.

RESOLVED: that there is a joint working group with the ECD OSC to consider the together the Local Plan Employment and Mixed Use Land Allocations and the results of the public consultation on the Economic and Commercial Development Strategy.

150. MAIDSTONE BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN - NEW AMENDED SITE ALLOCATIONS (ITEM 8 OF AGENDA FOR 20 JANUARY 2015)

The Chairman welcomed the Committee, visitors and Officers, Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development; Sarah Anderton, Principal Planning Officer, and; Steve Clarke, Principal Officer to the meeting.

The Chairman apologised for the error in allowing a member of the public to address the Committee at the meeting of 22 January 2015. She was unaware the person in question was not a parish councillor.

The Chairman went on to re-affirm the ruling on who was allowed to address the Committee on item 8 Maidstone Borough Local Plan – new and amended site allocations.

The Committee continued their discussions on the sites in Appendix A of item 8 of the agenda for 20 January 2015.

The Chairman explained at the adjourned meeting on 22 January 2015 the Committee agreed that a cross party group from the Committee met with Planning Officers before this meeting to discuss the development criteria and parameters for sites H1 (7) – North of Bicknor Wood, Gore Court Road, Otham; H1 (8) – West of Church Road, Otham, and; H1 (9) – Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road, Otham. The Chairman, Councillors English, Mrs Gooch and Powell met with Steve Clarke on 27 January. As a result of the meeting a number of changes to the layout and configuration of the sites were being suggested and these proposed changes would be brought back to Committee for further consideration. After this it was proposed these sites proceed to a further Regulation 18 consultation.

H1 (10) – South of Sutton Road, Langley

Councillor Burton left the Chamber during the discussions on this site.

Parish Councillor Taylor-Maggio addressed the Committee. She raised the concerns of Langley Parish Council with sites H1 (9) and H1 (10) and the proposed 1,100 homes in the parish. She stated the Bicknor Farm site was not just affecting Otham as a green buffer had been removed which was originally going to be included in the site and put in trust with Langley Amenity Trust to protect Langley from further development. Councillor Taylor-Maggio also raised concerns regarding H1 (10) in terms of its size and a green area, which was originally not to be developed, shown as part of the development area. She asked that this site be removed or reduced to 4/5 bedroomed houses and the reinstating of the green buffer. She stated the Parish Council could not support this site as it would act as a magnet for further development.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that site H1 (9) was included in the discussions with Officers and would be brought back to the Committee for further consideration with sites H1 (7) and H1 (8).

Parish Councillor Ian Ellis from Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council addressed the Committee and requested that site H1 (10) be removed. He stated the Parish Council accepted there would be some development in the parish but felt this was one site too many. There was a considerable concentration of development in a small area being proposed without the infrastructure to support it (congestion on the Sutton Road and sewage).

Councillor Mrs Stockell addressed the Committee and stated she supported the Parish Council's concerns with development in the area. She stated that south east urban extension was rejected in the past and this site should be removed.

Councillor Ring requested to address and stated the transport infrastructure in the area was of great concern as all the proposed developments were accessed via the Sutton Road where there was already issues with congestion particularly at the Wheatsheaf junction.

Councillor Daley addressed the Committee and stated all sites within the draft Local Plan had universal issues with highway infrastructure. He went on to say there was a need for Kent County Highways to object to development in the Maidstone borough and stated that highways were not able to cope unless Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levies were collected. Councillor Daley stated further that if Kent County Highways objected to the housing numbers, on the grounds of insufficient transport infrastructure, this would provide evidence to reduce the housing numbers and defend the position at the enquiry stage of the Local Plan.

Councillor Edwards-Daem addressed the Committee and stated she supported all the reasons already stated, as well as, the risk of urbanisation of the area, pollution, and, overcrowding of development.

Mr Jarman responded to the concerns raised and explained the clear tests of soundness of a local plan at the enquiry stage. He explained that the policies being discussed were not like planning applications and set broad parameters for development, not the detail. He went on to state, if the A274 was not able to take the amount of proposed development, applications for planning permission would need to include a transport assessment for the area with solutions to overcome any issues. If there was no suitable solution Kent County Highways should object. Mr Jarman stated that data would be needed to evidence that the infrastructure could not cope. However, infrastructure providers' information did not demonstrate this.

Mr Jarman went on to explain if Southern Water said there was insufficient capacity for development, developers would have to work with them to mitigate any issues.

Mr Clarke stated that developers were looking at solutions to upgrade the sewage system at Leeds, and Southern Water had indicated there was potential to do this.

Mr Clarke referred the Committee to the Urgent Update dated 20 January 2015, Appendix Two, showing proposed changes to the published criteria for site H1 (10) which included, clarity on the buffer to the eastern part of the site, upgrading of Public Rights of Way, retention of open land beyond the built development for the provision of SuDS surface water drainage mitigation and public open space, design proposals to take account of the results of the landscape and visual impact assessment on Loose Stream/Langley Loch and Langley Church, design proposals to consider the relationship of any development with the existing Langley Park development; preservation of the designated heritage assets.

During lengthy discussion the Committee raised concerns that taking sites out of the Local Plan would limit the boroughs control over development and pushing for a bypass may inadvertently open the area for further development. The Committee also discussed concerns regarding the volume of traffic from development in this area all converging at the Wheatsheaf junction.

Mr Clarke reminded the Committee that due to the changes in the Urgent Update report site H1 (10) would need to go back to Regulation 18 for further consultation.

Mr Jarman explained to the Committee that when this site went to Regulation 18 consultation between March and May 2014, Southern Water had not objected. He also stated that KCC did not object. He went on to state that further consultation at Regulation 18 on this site would give infrastructure providers another opportunity to lodge their concerns, but he said that Regulation 19 consultation would be the stage that would give infrastructure providers more information to base their decision on. If they objected at Regulation 19 stage it would provide sufficient justification for the site to be taken out of the Local Plan.

The Committee agreed further investigations were needed into the infrastructure capacity for the area of H1 (10).

The Committee agreed to take site **H1 (20) Postly Road, Tovil** next.

Mr Clarke informed the Committee that this site had an outline planning application.

Councillor Derek Mortimer addressed the Committee and stated that all political groups were opposed to the development of this site. He went on to say there had been a 650 signature petition, to save the site from development, presented to the council. Councillor Mortimer told the Committee the Parish Council was developing a Neighbourhood Plan and this site was not included in it. The Parish Council felt the site needed to be maintained to protect the rural setting and provide the parish with open space. He went on to state there was not enough open space in the parish, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) termed the site unsustainable, there were no bus links to the area, and, access was poor as it was a single track to the site. He stated the site should be removed.

Parish Councillor Abigail Hogg addressed the Committee and asked for the site to be removed due to the following concerns, the creation of urban sprawl into neighbouring North Loose, loss of a green wedge, traffic congestion on the A229, insufficient health facilities and school places.

The Committee discussed the concerns raised with this site, in particular the effect development of this site would have on the Loose Valley corridor, the difficulty of protecting the neighbouring agricultural land if this site were developed, and, the lack of sufficient community infrastructure to support it.

Mr Clarke reminded the Committee of the Landscape Capacity Study carried out on this site which had taken into account the adjacent conservation area.

Councillor Hogg left the meeting at 17:00 hrs.

H1 (11) – Springfield, Royal Engineers Road and Mill Lane, Maidstone

The Committee agreed for the amended site criteria and site area for this site and agreed the amendments go to Regulation 18 consultation.

H1 (12) – Haynes, Ashford Road, Maidstone

The Committee discussed the provision of open space for this site and agreed that off-site open space for this site was unacceptable as the only way of accessing it would involve crossing the busy A20. The Committee agreed on-site open space provision was necessary and could be achieved with a reduction in unit numbers.

The Committee also discussed the need for the development to be set back off the main A20 road.

H1 (13) – Medway Street Maidstone

The Committee discussed the loss of a council car park, however, there had been no objections to this site being included in the draft Local Plan. The Committee agreed there were concerns with pollution in the area and, as air quality was poor, the site needed to include significant planting to mitigate the effects of this on any development on the site.

H1 (14) – American Golf, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone

The Committee had no concerns with this site.

H1 (15) – 6, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone

The Committee had no concerns with this site.

H1 (16) – Laguna, Hart Street, Maidstone

The Committee heard this site had a deferred planning application which was awaiting a viability assessment.

The Committee agreed to defer site H1 (17) Barty Farm, Roundwell, Thurnham until Councillor De Wiggondene arrived.

H1 (18) – Whitmore Street, Maidstone

The Committee discussed the possible parking issues with this site but agreed this would be dealt with at the planning application stage.

H1 (19) – North Street, Barming

Mr Clarke informed the Committee there was a planning application in for this site. The policy had been strengthened to ensure the development was a 'frontage' development only and was set back off the road. He also

informed the Committee there was no support for development behind this site and the number of dwellings had been reduced.

H1 (21) – Kent Police Headquarters, Sutton Road, Maidstone
H1 (23) – Kent Police Training School, Sutton Road, Maidstone

The Committee were informed these two sites were subject to a planning application with a resolution to grant subject to a Section 106 agreement.

H1 (24) – West of Eclipse, Maidstone

The Committee discussed the ecological sensitivity of this site as it backed on to Boxley Woods.

Mr Clarke informed the Committee that the policy criteria for this site included an undeveloped area between the M20 and the site. Ecological surveys carried out on the site recommended a minimum landscape buffer of 15 meters from the woodland.

Councillors agreed the policy should be strengthened to ensure the buffer was not used as a pathway.

H1 (25) Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham

The Committee was informed that this site had a current planning application.

Councillor Sams addressed the Committee and stated she had noted that Neighbourhood Plans were a material consideration in planning terms and should be taken into account by Committee. She went on to state that the Parish Council had worked on the sustainability appraisal for the parish with Planning Officers and Ward Members who had found it to be sound and fair.

Councillor Sams informed the Committee that this site was in the Harrietsham Neighbourhood Plan and stated, if accepted, it must be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. This would involve, a lower density and reduced numbers, amended layout, provision for school places and strengthening of the community infrastructure, protection of wildlife and the existing pond, and the inclusion of natural green spaces, not just a green buffer but within the site too.

The Committee discussed at length the ecological importance of this site as a designated receptor site. The Committee raised concerns regarding the replacement of this site with another receptor site.

Mr Jarman informed the Committee that a suite of strategic policies were being developed for open spaces and receptor sites which would be presented to the Committee in the future.

H1 (26) South of Ashford Road, Harrietsham

Mr Clarke directed the Committee to the revised site map of this site showing an increase in its size. There was also an undetermined planning application on this this.

Councillor Sams addressed the Committee and informed them this was the old Channel Tunnel Rail Link site. She asked that the site be accepted in accordance with the emerging Harrietsham Neighbourhood Plan. The Parish Council felt the development of this site would create a village centre. The Parish Council asked for traffic calming on the A20 and for Section 106 contributions from the site to be used to link this site with other sites to improve the community infrastructure.

The Committee discussed concerns with the speed of traffic on the A20 through the village and the possible solutions to this.

H1 (27) – Mayfield Nursery, Ashford Road, Harrietsham
H1 (28) – Church Road, Harrietsham

Both sites were agreed by the Committee.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 18:20 and reconvened at 18:45.

H1 (29) – Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham
H1 (30) – Glebe Gardens, Lenham
H1 (31) – Ham Lane, Lenham

Mr Clarke reminded the Committee of the revised criteria for site H1 (29) which included, design standards to protect the views and vista, landscaping on the site to protect the setting of the Kent Downs and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a requirement for a landscape and visual impact assessment as part of a planning application.

Councillor Sams addressed the Committee and stated in her opinion development of this site would have a dramatic effect on the village. She stated there was insufficient community infrastructure to support it, there would be a loss of agricultural and amenity land, the area was prone to flooding, and, the increased traffic would make Lenham Square dangerous for pedestrians.

Councillor Powell addressed the Committee in respect of sites H1 (29), H1 (30) and H1 (31) all in Lenham. He raised concerns across the three sites regarding the protection of the village square which was designated as a conservation area, increased congestion in the village threatening the listed buildings, the total proposed housing numbers and the impact on tourism and the A20 corridor. He requested the Committee reject all three sites.

Councillor Colin Gillett, Chairman of Lenham Parish Council addressed the Committee. He stated that sites H1 (30) and H1 (31) were both grade 2 agricultural land, close to the A20 and the AONB. He went on to say that the Local Plan process should not exclude phase 2 (H2 policies) broad

allocations of sites (which allocated a further 1,500 houses to Lenham) when discussing the H1 policies, which allocated 245 houses to Lenham. Councillor Gillett stated the Parish Council was not clear what the proposed housing numbers were for Lenham and was unable to develop their Neighbourhood Plan as a result. He went on to say that development of 1,745 houses in Lenham would create significant infrastructure problems for the village.

Mr Jarman explained that MBC were proposing a broad location of 1,500 houses in the last five years (2026-2031) of the Local Plan which can be deleted at Regulation 19 stage if infrastructure providers objected to the numbers. He went on to say he would like to carry out detailed traffic modelling of the area, using an increase of 1,500 houses and 245 houses, to pick up some of the points raised by the Parish Council to try and justify improvements to junctions and possibly removing sites.

The Committee agreed detailed traffic modelling of the area was needed before the broad location (policies H2) sites went to Regulation 19 consultation.

The Committee also agreed that stronger criteria was needed, for each Policy H1 site in Lenham, on contributions towards highway safety measures.

The Committee raised concerns regarding site H1 (30) – Glebe Gardens and what was meant in the policy by Glebe Pond being 'enhanced'. The main concern was that Glebe Pond was described as the source of the River Len. European Water Directives state waterways should be opened up. The Committee agreed more information was needed on the impact of development on this site and the river source and how the natural environment would be enhanced and maintained.

Mr Clarke informed the Committee the policy for Glebe Gardens, Lenham included criteria specifically mentioning the spring lines on the site and requested a flood risk assessment which should incorporate appropriate drainage for the site.

The Committee agreed site H1 (29) - Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham did not extend the line of development of the village. However, the Committee agreed that site H1 (31) – Ham Lane, Lenham did represent an extension of the village line which would have a bigger impact on the AONB. Concern was also raised regarding the commercial and school sites on Ham Lane and development this site causing increased disruption on Ham Lane which was already congested.

H1 (32) – Howland Road, Marden

H1 (33) – Stanley Farm, Plain Road, Marden

H1 (34) – The Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden

H1 (35) – Marden Cricket and Hockey Club, Stanley Road, Marden

The Committee agreed sites H1 (32), (33), (34) and (35) were recommended to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation.

H1 (36) – Hen and Duckhurst Farm, Marden Road, Staplehurst
H1 (37) – Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst

Mr Clarke informed the Committee that site H1 (36) was subject to outline planning permission for 250 houses and site H1 (37) had a planning application pending for part of the site for 167 houses.

Councillor Perry addressed the Committee on behalf of Staplehurst Parish Council. He stated that the assumptions used to establish the housing allocation for these sites was too simplistic and unsustainable. He said the infrastructure issues affected both sites included traffic on the A229, the Marden/Headcorn cross roads and sewage and waste water infrastructures at full capacity.

Councillor Perry went on to explain the issues with the sewage infrastructure were current and needed to be dealt with before any further development of the area.

Councillor Perry also stated the housing allocation for site H1 (37) – Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst was too intense and would put pressure on the Headcorn Road flood plain, impact the belt of special scientific interest and create problems with traffic. He said dealing with the infrastructure issues with these two sites was critical and guarantees were needed before development took place.

The Committee discussed possible issues with Section 106 agreements for previous developments in the area not being used to improve the infrastructure they were intended for. The Committee agreed that the criteria for site H1 (36) needed to include a strategic solution to sewage and waste water issues.

The Committee discussed the draft housing allocation for site H1 (37) of 535 which was not accepted by the Parish Council or residents of Staplehurst.

Mr Jarman informed the Committee this was the maximum number that would be accepted for development of this site and could reduce. The policy had to state a housing allocation to show MBC had attempted to meet the objectively assessed housing need.

The Committee agreed it was unable to state a reduced figure without evidence to back up a reduction. It was important that the dispersed pond and tree features on the site should be protected by a high quality design that enhanced these features. The Committee also agreed Borough and Parish Councillors should agree the wording of the policies for the constraints on this site.

Councillor de Wiggondene joined the meeting at 21:30hrs.

Councillor Ash moved to substitute for Councillor Ross.

H1 (38) – Old School Nursery, Station Road, Headcorn

Mr Clarke informed the Committee this site had planning permission for nine units. Councillor Thick informed the Committee the Parish Council accepted this site. The Committee agreed sites H1 (38) be recommended to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation.

H1 (39) – Ulcombe Road and Mill Bank, Headcorn

H1 (40) – Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn

H1 (41) – South of Grigg Lane, Headcorn

H1 (42) – Knaves Acres, Headcorn

Mr Clarke informed the Committee:

- Site H1 (39) - had a pending Planning Application which had not yet been determined;
- Site H1 (40) – had two planning permissions and one planning application;
- Sites H1 (41) and H1 (42) had no planning applications.

Councillor Thick addressed the Committee and described Headcorn as being situated in an area where four low gradient rivers met. The area had problems draining water as a result. He went on to say that Headcorn is described in the draft Local Plan as one of the most sustainable sites in the Borough. Councillor Thick disputed this description and explained Headcorn was up river from Staplehurst and had the same infrastructure issues as Staplehurst.

Councillor Thick went on to explain that site H1 (39) was on a slope and drainage and sewage would directly impact on the Kings Road area. He explained that all sites in the draft Local Plan in Headcorn would impact on each other because of historical sewage and surface water drainage issues. He also stated that Headcorn was on the A274 which led to the Sutton Road which would impact on the increased traffic issues already discussed in this area. He stated further development of Headcorn was unsustainable.

Councillor Round addressed the Committee and supported the comments made by Councillor Thick. He also raised issues regarding the single road access to site H1 (39), which flooded regularly, the lack of school places in the village, the cost of travelling to work from Headcorn as there was not enough jobs in the village and congested roads. He went on to state the distinctive rural character of the village needed to be taken into account and the proportion of development allocated to Headcorn was unsustainable.

The Committee discussed concerns regarding Kent County Highways and the consistency of their advice on highway capacity and safety and the advice of other infrastructure providers.

The Committee discussed the issues with all four sites and agreed the sewage capacity, flood risk, school places and highways issues were of concern. The Committee discussed the need for consistency when

accepting or rejecting sites from the draft Local Plan. With the issues faced by Headcorn, the Committee discussed taking the approach of seeking mitigation prior to any development of the site, or rejecting the site as they did for site H1 (65).

The Committee agreed all sites had to be rejected due to the severity of the issues with the exception of the parts of site H1 (40) which were going through the planning application process.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 22:10 and reconvened at 22:20 hrs.

The Committee went on to discuss site **H1 (17) Barty Farm, Roundwell, Thurnham.**

Councillor Springett left the room and Councillor English took the Chair.

Councillor de Wiggondene addressed the Committee and expressed his disappointment that this site was back in the draft Local Plan. He went on to state that there were concerns regarding access to the site and highways issues and there were the same issues with school places as sites in Bearsted. He explained the area was a special landscape area, was not sustainable and he considered it should be removed.

Councillor Ash agreed with all the issues raised by Councillor de Wiggondene.

The Committee agreed the issues with this site were the same as other sites already discussed in Bearsted and agreed the site should be rejected.

Councillor Springett returned to the Chair.

H1 (46) Vicarage Road, Yalding

Councillor Springett read out a statement on behalf of Councillor McLoughlin which raised concerns regarding this site, which included the location, vehicular and pedestrian access, traffic congestion, public transport connections and the designation of Yalding as a Larger Village.

The Committee discussed potential flooding issues with the site and were informed the site was in an area higher than the river. Criteria in the policy required any planning application to include flood mitigation measures.

The Committee agreed if the Parish Council had issues with flooding on this site they would have objected to it being included in the draft Local Plan. The Committee also agreed that Yalding had been allocated very little development in comparison to other parishes.

H1 (47) – Hubbards Lane and Haste Hill, Boughton Monchelsea

There were no issues raised with this site.

H1 (48) – Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea

The Committee agreed to the recommendation to delete this site as there was no access.

H1 (49) – East of Eyhorn Street, Hollingbourne

The Committee discussed if any issues had been raised regarding the impact this site would have on listed buildings. No concerns had been raised so Committee agreed this site should be accepted.

H1 (5) – West of Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne

The Committee was informed that a planning application was pending on this site with a resolution to grant. The Committee agreed this site should be accepted.

RESOLVED: That

- 1 The Committee recommend that Cabinet approve new housing site allocation policies as set out in Appendix A/B for Regulation 19 consultation in February 2015, subject to:
 - a) The proposed changes to the layout and configuration of sites H1 (7) – North of Bicknor Wood, Gore Court Road, Otham; H1 (8) – West of Church Road, Otham, and, H1 (9) – Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road, Otham being brought back to the committee by the Head of Planning and Development for further consideration after which the sites should proceed to a further Regulation 18 consultation.
 - b) The proposed changes to the proposed yield, site criteria and site area for site H1 (10) – South of Sutton Road, Langley as amended by the Urgent Update Report being accepted for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015.
 - c) The infrastructure provision for this site H1 (10) – South of Sutton Road, Langley, ie Highway infrastructure – Wheatsheaf junction congestion, and, insufficient sewage infrastructure capacity being further investigated to seek appropriate mitigation.

Recorded votes:

- For – 5
- Against – 4
- Abstain – 0

- d) The proposed changes to the site criteria and site area for site H1 (11) – Springfield, Royal Engineers Road and Mill Lane, being accepted as amended by the Urgent Update Report and Appendices for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015.

- e) Site H1 (12) – Haynes, Ashford Road, Maidstone being accepted subject to the following being included in the policy:
 - A requirement for significant on site open space being provided;
 - A significant contribution towards off site open space, and;
 - The development be reasonably set back from the Ashford Road.
- f) Site H1 (13) – Medway Street, Maidstone being accepted subject to significant planting to mitigate the effect of poor quality in the area.
- g) Site H1 (14) – American Golf, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone being accepted.
- h) Site H1 (15) – 6, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone being accepted.
- i) Site H1 (16) – Laguna, Hart Street, Maidstone being accepted.
- j) H1 (17) – Barty Farm, Roundwell, Maidstone be rejected and taken out because school provision in the parish is at full capacity and there is no space to expand the existing schools.
- k) Site H1 (18) – Whitmore Street, Maidstone being accepted.
- l) Site H1 (19) - North Street, Barming being accepted.
- m) Site H1 (20) – Postly Road, Tovil being rejected due to:
 - The detrimental effect on the Loose Valley corridor;
 - The difficulty in defending the adjacent high quality agricultural land from future development, and;
 - The community infrastructure already at capacity with no reasonable improvements possible.
- n) Site H1 (21) – Kent Police Headquarters, Sutton Road, Maidstone being accepted.
- o) Site H1 (22) Kent Police Training School, Sutton Road, Maidstone being accepted.
- p) H1 (23) – New Line Learning, Boughton Lane, Loose be deferred for consideration until after the Public Enquiry.
- q) Site H1 (24) – West of Eclipse, Maidstone being accepted subject to:
 - A minimum of a 15 meter green buffer around the site, and;
 - The layout and landscaping of the site aims to minimise the impact of the development on the adjacent ancient woodland.

Recorded vote:

- For – 4
- Against – 3
- Abstain – 1

Councillor Chittenden asked for his dissent to be noted.

- r) The Head of Planning and Development undertaking, and completing, within three months, traffic modelling work in Lenham using 245 units (Policy H1) and 1500 units (Policy H2) in the broad location and report back to the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee before Regulation 19 consultation and to feed into any planning application coming forward for any sites in Lenham.
- s) Site H1 (25) – Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham being rejected and taken out of the draft Local Plan on the basis that it is a receptor site and should go back to Regulation 18 for deletion.
- t) H1 (26) – South of Ashford Road, Harrietsham be accepted subject to the necessary highway safety and traffic calming improvements being an integral part of the policy.
- u) H1 (27) – Mayfield Nursery, Ashford Road, Harrietsham be accepted.
- v) H1 (28) – Church Road, Harrietsham be accepted
- w) Site H1 (29) – Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham being accepted subject to the delivery of high quality landscape protection to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in consultation with the Parish Council and Lenham Neighbourhood Plan Group to deliver a high quality scheme.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 6
- Against – 1
- Abstain - 1

- x) Site H1 (30) – Glebe Gardens, Lenham being deferred pending clarification of the outcome of a detailed impact assessment regarding the preservation and enhancement of the pond which is the source of the Len.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 7
- Against – 1
- Abstain - 0

- y) Site H1 (31) – Ham Lane, Lenham being rejected on the basis that the landscape impact of any development of this site on the village and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty cannot be mitigated.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 7
- Against – 1
- Abstain – 0

- u) Site H1 (32) – Howland Road, Marden, being accepted.

- v) Site H1 (33) – Stanley Farm, Plain Road, Marden, being accepted.

- w) Site H1 (34) – The Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden, being accepted.

- x) Site H1 (35) – Marden Cricket and Hockey Club, Stanley Road, Marden, being accepted.

- y) Site H1 (36) – Hen and Duckhurst Farm, Marden Road, Staplehurst being accepted subject to:

- Issues with the site being addressed as part of a strategic sewage and waste water solution for Staplehurst and Headcorn, and;
- Subject to an additional surface and foul water solution being included with the design of any development for this area.

Recorded vote:

- For – 8
- Against – 0
- Abstain – 0

- z) Site H1 (37) – Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst, being accepted subject to:

- The insertion in the policy of a maximum development of 535 units;
- The insertion in the policy of a stronger worded paragraph, involving Borough and Parish Councillors, on the constraints on this site;
- Issues with the site being addressed as part of a strategic sewage and waste water solution for Staplehurst and Headcorn, and;
- Subject to an additional surface and flood water solution being included with the design of any development for this area.

Recorded vote:

- For – 6
- Against – 2
- Abstain – 0

aa) Site H1 (38) – Old School Nursery, Station Road, Headcorn being agreed

bb) Site H1 (39) – Ulcombe Road and Mill Bank, Headcorn being rejected on the grounds of:

- Severe highways congestion;
- Severe flood risk in the area; and,
- A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 9
- Against – 0
- Abstain - 0

cc) Site H1 (40) – Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn – the parts of the site with a planning application and the part of the site with a resolution to permit being accepted.

dd) Site H1 (40) – Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn – remainder of the site without planning permission being rejected on the grounds of:

- Severe highways congestion;
- Severe flood risk in the area; and,
- A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 9
- Against – 0
- Abstain - 0

ee) Site H1 (41) – South of Grigg Lane, Headcorn being rejected on the grounds of:

- Severe highways congestion;
- Severe flood risk in the area; and,
- A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 9
- Against – 0
- Abstain - 0

ff) Site H1 (42) – Knaves Acres, Headcorn being rejected on the grounds of:

- Severe highways congestion;
- Severe flood risk in the area; and,
- A lack of a sewage infrastructure capable of dealing with further development.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 9
- Against – 0
- Abstain - 0

Recorded Vote:

- For – 9
- Against – 0
- Abstain - 0

gg) Site H1 (46) – Vicarage Road, Yalding being accepted.

Recorded Vote:

- For – 9
- Against – 0
- Abstain - 0

hh) Site H1 (47) – Hubbards Land and Haste Hill Road, Boughton Monchelsea being accepted.

ii) Site H1 (48) – Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea being rejected, as set out in Appendix D of the agenda, for Regulation 18 consultation in February 2015.

jj) Site H1 (49) – East of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street (Hollingbourne) being accepted.

kk) Site H1 (50 – West of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street (Hollingbourne) being accepted.

151. LONG MEETING

Prior to 10:30pm, during consideration of Maidstone Borough Local Plan – new and amended site allocations, the Committee considered whether to adjourn the meeting at 10:30pm or continue until 11:00pm if necessary.

RESOLVED: That the meeting continue until 11:00pm, if necessary.

152. FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee discussed the Future Work Programme and agreed that an item on the Invicta Barracks, Maidstone site should be included on the agenda for the meeting on 17 February 2015.

RESOLVED: that Committee:

Noted the Future Work Programme and agreed an item on Invicta Barracks, Maidstone be included on the agenda for the meeting of 17 February 2015;

Noted the List for Forthcoming Decisions at Appendix B, and;

Noted the SCRAIP update at Appendix C.

153. MEETING DURATION

15:00hrs to 22:55hrs