

APPENDIX A – Schedule of responses to the representations to the sites in Policy H1

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (1)	Bridge Nursery, London Road, Maidstone.	
Number of Support (1) / Object (22) / General Observations (2)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic / congestion – highway capacity concerns. Cumulative impact of development on local transport infrastructure, including junction capacity issues north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at Junction 5 M20. Unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund the necessary off-site infrastructure. Unnecessary junction at A20. The junction capacity issues at the north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at J5M20 need to be addressed now (East Malling PC). Alternative route through East Malling cannot take more traffic (East Malling PC).</p> <p>Bus service welcomed. Bus service welcomed but route description too prescriptive. Amend to read "a bus service that links new housing developments in the area with the hospital and the town centre".</p> <p>Extend public footpath along the railway line (East Malling PC). Suggest that a public footpath be extended along the railway line.</p> <p>Criterion 7 seeks contributions towards pedestrian and cycle links to surrounding essential infrastructure. This criterion should be amended to confirm that it will be a proportionate contribution only based on the scale of this development.</p>	<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process.</p> <p>Noted. Bus route is considered to provide the most appropriate level of access to the hospital and town centre.</p> <p>At this point the railway is on embankment and footpath would be difficult to provide.</p> <p>All planning obligations are negotiated on the basis of the scale of the development and requirements of policy with evidence provided.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Criterion 8 requires an appropriate contribution towards highways improvement schemes along the A20. However, the criterion wording must acknowledge the proportionate nature of any contribution and that the amount for each junction/enhancement must be justified.		
Impact on air quality. Air quality impacts at Hermitage Lane / Tonbridge road junction. Criterion 2(ii) should be flexibly worded to enable various techniques to be considered other than the ecological corridor to incorporate noise attenuation. It is unclear how criterion 3 will be met.	Criterion 2 ii identifies one of a number of measures which can be taken to improve air quality and incorporated into potential new policy for the Maidstone North-west strategic housing location.	No change.
Concerns about vehicle access to the site.	Access issues have been agreed with the highways authority as being adequate to service the quantity of development planned for the site.	No change.
Concern about impact on the ecological value of the site / detrimental to local wildlife and habitats/ impact on ancient woodland. Question how the protected habitat will be protected long term (East Malling PC).	Criterion 11 is in place to address the ecological impacts of proposed development, and surveys have been undertaken which support the continued allocation. Prior to commencement of development a condition on the planning permission will require submission and implementation of landscape and ecological management plan.	No change to allocation but consideration to be given to clarifying strategic habitats protection policy.
Loss of amenity area – this is one of only two amenity areas.	Criterion 4 requires publicly accessible open space to be provided in any proposed development.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure.	Specific and detailed infrastructure requirements are indicated in existing strategic policies and H1. Further strategic policies will strengthen these	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.

	requirements for strategic housing locations.	
Loss of Countryside / Rural Character. Loss of semi-rural character of Barming. Coalescence between villages and concerned that development may be cross-boundary. Proposals erode separation of Allington from the Medway Gap (East Malling PC).	Existing strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area. Further strategic policies will strengthen these requirements for strategic housing locations.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.
Loss of Grade 2 Agricultural Land.	The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey undertaken in 1994 confirms that land on the site is predominantly Grade 2. However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable in this allocated greenfield site. Strategic policies seek to reduce the impact of development on high quality agricultural land. The site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission.	No change.
Impact on Local school.	Criterion 5 requires contributions from prospective developers for community infrastructure provision.	No change.
Unsustainable development.	Existing Policy NPPF1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities.	No change.

Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (2)	East of Hermitage Lane, Maidstone.		
Number of Support (1) / Object (57) / General Observations (6)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic / congestion - highway capacity concerns. General concerns about transport requirements. Parking concerns and emergency vehicle access concerns.</p> <p>Cumulative impact of development on local transport infrastructure, including junction capacity issues north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at Junction 5 M20. Unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund the necessary off-site infrastructure. The junction capacity issues at the north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at J5M20 need to be addressed now (East Malling PC). Alternative route through East Malling cannot take more traffic (East Malling PC). Additional roundabouts on Hermitage Lane required to improve traffic flow.</p> <p>Concern about proposed bus service via Howard Drive.</p>		<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process.</p> <p>Provision of an additional bus service is widely supported. Bus route is considered</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<p>Amend policy to read "a bus service that links new housing developments in the area with the hospital and the town centre".</p> <p>Need for permanent cycle routes. Sufficient parking needed for community infrastructure. Maintain and improve green footpath corridors.</p> <p>Assessment of the capacity of the A26 is required (Wateringbury PC).</p> <p>Highway schemes must precede development and there is concern about finding facilities.</p>	<p>to provide the most appropriate level of access to the hospital and town centre.</p> <p>Criterion 5 required the wooded character of KB19 to be maintained. A direct cycle path will be required as part of any proposed development. (Criterion 21).</p> <p>A Section 106 Agreement will ensure infrastructure is in place to serve the development. This can include trigger points for infrastructure provision where justified.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Pollution - noise and light. Impact on air quality. Air quality impacts at Hermitage Lane / Tonbridge road junction. The impacts on air quality arising from new development in Maidstone on areas beyond the borough boundary should also be taken into account, for example in relation to Wateringbury and the Hermitage Lane allocations (Tonbridge and Malling BC).</p>	<p>Air quality issues are covered by strategic and detailed policies. Criterion 12 identifies one of a number of measures which can be taken to improve air quality and incorporated into potential new policy for the Maidstone North-west strategic housing location.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.</p>
<p>Concerns about vehicle access to the site at Hermitage Lane and Howard Drive. Criteria should include highway access appraisals (Wateringbury PC). Automated gate unsuitable. There should be no access through the woodland.</p>	<p>Access issues have been carefully considered and specific proposals made to mitigate impacts. The Council is not proposing access through the woodland.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Proposed number of dwellings too high. Should have lower density than proposed. Too many houses in field surrounding reservoir.</p>	<p>The proposed number of houses is considered appropriate having regard to the site's characteristics and the need to make the efficient use of land.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Impact on the ecological value of the site / detrimental to local</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies are in</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen</p>

wildlife and habitats (incl bluebell wood) / impact on existing trees / impact on ancient woodland. Landscape buffer should be 30m. Protect Ancient Woodland. Field between hospital and Ancient Woodland should be used to create Ancient Woodland buffer / open space	place to protect habitats, wildlife and ancient woodlands. Criteria 13-17 relate to open space. Criteria 2 relates to Ancient Woodland.	the treatment of ecological issues and biodiversity.
Inadequate infrastructure - sewerage Infrastructure is at capacity.	Specific provision is being made to provide appropriate levels of physical infrastructure. No objection to proposed development has been made by Southern Water.	No change.
Loss of agricultural land. Protection must be given to agricultural Land (including Grade 1) / orchards .	The site was predominantly assessed as Grade 2 agricultural land with smaller proportions of Grade 3a and Grade 3b land in the 1994 ALC survey. However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable in this allocated greenfield site. Strategic policies seek to reduce the impact of development on high quality agricultural land.	No change.
Loss of green corridor.	Policy includes the retention of open space and woodland throughout the site.	No change.
Impact on countryside and rural character. Loss of semi-rural character of Barming. Coalescence between villages and concerned that development is at TBMB boundary. Proposals erode separation of Allington from the Medway Gap (East Malling PC).	Strategic policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.
Loss of amenity area – this is one of only two amenity areas. Open space needed. Impact on lifestyle of established residents.	Strategic and detailed policies seek to reduce the detrimental impacts of development. Criterion 4. notes that publicly accessible open space will be required as an element of any proposed development.	No change.
Inappropriate extension to urban area.	Sustainability appraisal and other analysis supports this location for sustainable	No change.

	development.	
Risk of flooding.	The site is not within floods zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed. Flooding was not one of the reasons for the recent refusal of permission on this site.	No change.
Pressure on local services and facilities including school and doctor surgery, lack of dental surgery. Cumulative impacts with TMBC developments. Alternative location for Maidstone Baptist church? Community facilities should have adequate parking.	Specific strategic policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development. Parking space provision will be considered as part of the planning application process.	No change.
Loss of views.	The loss of views is not a material planning consideration, except insofar as it relates to the maintenance of environmental quality which is covered by landscape and related measures.	No change.
Impact on aquifer.	None of the statutory undertakers have raised this as an issue against the allocation of this site.	No change.
Loss of open area. MBC has not justified its allocation of the field at the South Western extent as public open space, contrary to allocation in saved Local Plan (2000) and Interim Policy SS1b, and has no regard to outline planning application (Barton Willmore). Object to wording	Emergent information supports additional open space provision in this location.	No change.

of policy criteria (Barton Willmore).			
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Howard Drive suffers from subsidence		This would be dealt with through the planning application process and Building Control assessments.	No change
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (3)	West of Hermitage Lane, Maidstone		
Number of Support (2) / Object (22) / General Observations (3)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic / congestion - highway capacity concerns. Parking and emerging vehicle access concerns. Cumulative impact of development on local transport infrastructure, including junction capacity issues north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at Junction 5 M20. Unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund the necessary off-site infrastructure.		The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process.	No change.
Amend policy to read "a bus service that links new housing developments in the area with the hospital and the town centre".		Provision of an additional bus service is widely supported. Bus route is considered to provide provide the most	No change.

<p>Retain existing footpath. Public Right of Way need to be retained</p> <p>Assessment of the capacity of A26 is required (Wateringbury PC).</p> <p>The junction capacity issues at the north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at J5M20 need to be addressed now (East Malling PC).</p> <p>Alternative route through East Malling cannot take more traffic (East Malling PC).</p>	<p>appropriate level of access to the hospital and town centre.</p> <p>Appropriate footpath provision is made in items Criteria 3, 5 and 6. Existing Public Rights of Way cannot be diverted or altered without approval of the highway authority.</p> <p>Strategic transport proposals have taken account of main road capacities in negotiation with the highway authority and the Highways Agency.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Impact on air quality. Air quality impacts at Hermitage Lane / Tonbridge road junction. The impacts on air quality arising from new development in Maidstone on areas beyond the borough boundary should also be taken into account, for example in relation to Wateringbury and the Hermitage Lane allocations (Tonbridge and Malling BC).</p>	<p>Air quality issues are covered by Criterion 8 and potential new policy for the Maidstone North-west strategic housing location.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.</p>
<p>Concerns about vehicle access to the site via Oakapple Lane. Criteria should include highway access appraisals (Wateringbury PC). Principle access should be via Oakapple Lane . Broomshaw Road is not suitable and should be used for walking and cycling only .</p>	<p>Specific policy is included to ensure that any alterations to Oakapple Lane will retain the features which are integral to its character. Broomshaw Road is not proposed to provide vehicular access, from this site. It is more appropriate that the principle access is from Hermitage Lane, leaving Oakapple Lane for mainly pedestrians, cyclists and emergence vehicle access.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure.</p>	<p>Specific provision is being made to</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen</p>

	provide appropriate levels of physical infrastructure. Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers.	infrastructure requirements.
Loss of agricultural Land / countryside / greenfield land.	Some loss of agricultural land is inevitable in this allocated greenfield site. Strategic policies seek to reduce the impact of development on high quality agricultural land. The southern part of the site was assessed as Grade 3a in the 1994 ALC survey. The entire site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission.	No change.
Loss of green and blue corridor.	Any loss of green and blue corridor land is to be kept to a minimum in line with landscape and related protection policies.	No change.
Impact on countryside and rural character. Loss of semi-rural character of Barming. Coalescence between villages and concerned that development is at TBMB boundary. Proposals erode separation of Allington from the Medway Gap (East Malling PC).	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.
Pressure on local services and facilities including the school and doctor surgery, lack of dental surgery.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development.	No change.
Impact on the ecological value of the site / detrimental to local wildlife and habitats / impact on existing hedgerows / impact on ancient woodland.	Strategic and detailed policies are in place to protect habitats, wildlife and ancient woodlands.	New policy formulation to strengthen the treatment of ecological issues and biodiversity.
Proposed number of dwellings too high.	The proposed number of houses is considered appropriate having regard to the site's characteristics and the need to make the efficient use of land. The site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission.	No change.

Unsustainable development.		Existing Policy NPPF1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities.	No change.
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (4)	Oakapple Lane, Barming		
Number of Support (1) / Object (26) / General Observations (3)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic / congestion. Highway capacity concerns. Cumulative impact of development on local transport infrastructure, including junction capacity issues north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at Junction 5 M20. Unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund the necessary off-site infrastructure.</p> <p>Amend policy to read "a bus service that links new housing developments in the area with the hospital and the town centre".</p>		<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Provision of an additional bus service is widely supported. Bus route is considered to provide the most appropriate level of access to the hospital and town centre.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<p>The junction capacity issues at the north and south ends of Hermitage Lane and at J5M20 need to be addressed now (East Malling PC).</p> <p>Alternative route through East Malling cannot take more traffic (East Malling PC). Assessment of the capacity of A26 is required (Wateringbury PC).</p> <p>Public Right of Way needs to be protected</p>	<p>Strategic transport proposals have taken account of main road capacities in negotiation with the highway authority.</p> <p>The Public Right of Way runs adjacent to this site. Access through the adjacent site will be protected as part of development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Impact on air quality. The impacts on air quality arising from new development in Maidstone on areas beyond the borough boundary should also be taken into account, for example in relation to Wateringbury and the Hermitage Lane allocations (Tonbridge and Malling BC). Air quality impacts at Hermitage Lane / Tonbridge road junction.</p>	<p>Air quality issues are covered by strategic and detailed policies and will be considered in new policy for the Maidstone North-west strategic housing location.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.</p>
<p>Criteria should include highway access appraisals (Wateringbury PC). Concerns about vehicle access to the site via Oakapple Lane. Vehicle access via Hermitage Lane only (Barming PC).</p>	<p>Detailed consideration has been given to access arrangements, and specifically, the character of Oakapple Lane is to be retained.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure.</p>	<p>Specific provision is being made to provide appropriate levels of physical infrastructure. Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p>
<p>Impact on countryside and rural character; loss of semi-rural character of Barming. Cumulative impact with other sites on local environment and character. Overdevelopment in this location.</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.</p>
<p>Loss of Grade 2 agricultural Land / countryside / greenfield.</p>	<p>Some loss of agricultural land is inevitable to enable development to take place on this greenfield site but this is kept to a</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	minimum. This has to be weighed against the fact that this is a sustainable site on the edge of the urban area.	
Loss of green and blue corridor.	Any loss of green and blue corridor land is to be kept to a minimum in line with landscape and related protection policies.	No change.
Pressure on local services and facilities - school and doctor surgery, lack of dental surgery.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development.	No change.
Loss of green space including greenspace used by residents / buffer to the quarry.	Loss of green and open space is to be kept to a minimum, and specific measures provide landscape buffers.	No change.
Impact on the ecological value of the site / detrimental to local wildlife and habitats / impact on existing hedgerows / impact on ancient woodland.	Strategic and detailed policies are in place to protect habitats, wildlife and ancient woodlands.	New policy formulation to strengthen the treatment of ecological issues and biodiversity.
Proposed number of dwellings too high.	The proposed number of houses is considered appropriate having regard to the site's characteristics and the need to make the efficient use of land.	No change.
Unsustainable development.	Existing Policy NPPF1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities.	No change.
Inappropriate extension to urban area. Coalescence between villages and concerned that development is at TBMB boundary. Proposals erode separation of Allington from the Medway Gap (East Malling PC).	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	No change.

<p>Vehicular access via Hermitage Lane only. This appears to be a land-locked site. Inappropriate access . Reject access from Oakapple Lane.</p> <p>This appears to be a land-locked site. There appears to be no means of access other than: purchase of houses in Rede Wood Road or Broomshaw Road to “clear a way” through to those respective roads.; or a Legal arrangement with the owner/developer of H1(3) to allow access on to Oakapple Lane; or a Legal arrangement(s) with the land owner(s) at the South westerly corner to allow access onto the single track byway (KM13) connecting Sweets Lane (northerly) and North Pole Road (southerly), the length of which is totally unsuitable/inadequate for traffic and would give rise to significant highway safety issues. PROW KM11 has always been, and continues to be, in constant use and highly valued by local walkers and dog walkers and needs to be protected and maintained.</p>		<p>Additional access is required to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by proposed development.</p> <p>Criterion 4 indicates that primary access is intended to be taken from the adjacent development site H1 (3) (Land West of Hermitage Lane). Secondary access is indicated from Rede Wood Road or Broomshaw Road. It is not intended to upgrade access on the track past the water-tower onto North Pole Road. Existing Public Rights of Way cannot be diverted or altered without approval of the highway authority.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.</p>		<p>If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.</p>	
<p>Policy Number</p> <p>H1 (5)</p>	<p>Site Name</p> <p>Langley Park, Sutton Road, Boughton Monchelsea</p>		
<p>Number of Support (2) / Object (24) / General Observations (1)</p>			
<p>Summary of issues</p>		<p>Officer Response</p>	<p>Proposed change</p>
<p>Increased traffic /congestion. Highway capacity concerns (including</p>		<p>The council takes full account of the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>at Otham village). Unsuitable road network. Highway safety concerns. Pressure on rural lanes. Highway impacts (including HGV traffic concerns along Willington Street). Increased rat-running. Additional train capacity needed. Lack of parking at train stations. Impact on cyclist / horses / pedestrians. Lack of traffic management survey. Inadequate transport strategy. Cumulative impact on congestion and infrastructure unacceptable. Collective impact of 2750 dwelling on SE edge of Maidstone on transport network unacceptable (Swale BC). Poor parking facilities.</p> <p>Access and egress from the south side of the town is subject to severe delays (Swale BC).</p> <p>Willington Street / A20 junction already at capacity. Willington Street / Wheatsheaf Junction unsuitable for increased traffic. No plans to improve roads and junctions east towards Hollingbourne.</p> <p>Solution is not a new road at Leeds/Langley. Park and Ride scheme required.</p> <p>Proposed alternative highway route via J8, removal of HGV traffic along Willington Street, 20mph speed limit and additional pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>No reference made to new road in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Pollution – including air quality concerns.</p>	<p>Air quality mitigation measures are included in Criterion 10.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.</p>
<p>Detrimental to wildlife and habitats.</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies are in place to protect habitats, wildlife and ancient woodlands.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.</p>
<p>Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities – including school, medical facilities, public services, transport, hospital, burial space in local church yard. Looking for potential location to relocated Maidstone Baptist Church.</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Impact on amenities of existing residents. Impact on quality of life.</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies are in</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Impact on rural activities. Loss of privacy of existing residents.</p>	<p>place to reduce the detrimental impacts of proposed development. Specific measures are included in SP5 Countryside to encourage rural activities. There are no residents immediately adjacent to this site. The site now has planning permission.</p>	
<p>Inadequate infrastructure, including water supply.</p>	<p>Specific provision is being made to provide appropriate levels of physical infrastructure. Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p>
<p>Loss of greenfield land. Loss of landscape. Unacceptable impact on countryside (Swale BC).</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area. Some loss of greenfield land is necessary to accommodate future housing growth and the countryside and landscape impacts of development on this site are considered to have been adequately mitigated against.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.</p>
<p>Development of Maidstone misconceived. High number of houses compared to other areas. Housing numbers are out of scale with infrastructure. Density too high. Support housing at 35dph. Brownfield first. Does not take account of homes already built.</p>	<p>Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required and the implementation of national policy. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities. The proposed number of houses is considered appropriate having regard to the site's</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	characteristics and the need to make the efficient use of land.	
Detrimental impacts on historic and listed buildings. Impact on rural character. Impact on heritage assets.	Strategic policies promote conservation and the protection of heritage and high quality environments. The site allocation policy includes a specific provision for the protection of the setting of the listed Bicknor Farmhouse.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.
Coalescence with other settlements. Increased urban sprawl. These sites will surround Boughton Monchelsea with development.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area. The policy (and consented planning application) provided for open space to the south of the site. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities. The role of the Local Plan is to plan future development and thereby prevent uncontrolled urban sprawl.	No change.
Unsustainable development. Will be reliant on private cars. No local employment opportunities.	Existing Policy NPPF1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. The site is adjacent to the Parkwood Industrial Estate and Maidstone itself is a centre for employment.	No change.
Access via dedicated loop linked to Sutton Rd only with emergency	Access is identified at the most	No change.

and pedestrian access onto Gore Court Road and White Hose Lane. Access points need to be addressed. Access for public transport into Bircholt Road is welcomed and note a highway link is included with H1(10).	appropriate locations for all modes, including for emergency services.	
Support for a 2 form entry primary school.	Community infrastructure, including extra school contributions is included in policy requirements. A school is provided as part of the planning consent for this site.	No change.
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.	If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Conflicts with H1(10) regarding the boundary of two sites. Policy H1(10) requires that links be made through to the adjacent site (owned by Taylor Wimpey) for a secondary access. Lack of such reciprocal requirements within Policy H1(5) to ensure that such links can be achieved.	Agreed	Include additional criteria in Policy H1(5). A separate cycle and pedestrian access will be provided to site H1(10) South of Sutton Road subject to agreement with the highways authority and the Borough Council
Risk of flooding to Boughton	The site is not within floods zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (6)	North of Sutton Road, Otham	
Number of Support (2) / Object (20) / General Observations (0)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic /congestion. Highway capacity concerns (including at Otham village). Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian). Pressure on rural lanes. Poor local roads. Highway impacts (including HGV traffic concerns along Willington Street). Increased rat-running. Rural roads unsuitable for development. Additional train capacity needed. Lack of public transport. Lack of parking at train station. Impact on cyclist / horses / pedestrians. Lack of traffic management survey.</p> <p>Cumulative impact on congestion and infrastructure. Support for pedestrian and cycle links. Collective impact of 2750 dwelling on SE edge of Maidstone on transport network unacceptable (Swale BC).</p> <p>Access and egress from the south side of the town is subject to severe delays (Swale BC).</p> <p>Willington Street / A20 junction already at capacity. Willington Street / Wheatsheaf Junction unsuitable for increased traffic. No plans to improve roads and junctions east towards Hollingbourne.</p> <p>Solution is not a new road at Leeds/ Langley.</p>	<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking.</p> <p>The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Proposed alternative highway route via J8, removal of HGV traffic along Willington Street, 20mph speed limit and additional pedestrian crossing.	No reference made to new road in the Local Plan.	
Development of Maidstone misconceived. Number of houses does not take into account already built homes. Too much housing on one area. High number of houses compared to other areas. Housing numbers are out of scale with infrastructure. Many buildings stand empty in the town and there are brownfield sites – seems disproportionate to destroy small rural village. Support housing at 35dph.	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of rigorous process of analysis of the housing required (SHMA) and the availability and suitability of potential sites (SHLAA).	No change.
Detrimental to wildlife and habitats. Existing hedgerows must be retained. Impact on ancient woodland.	Strategic and detailed policies are in place to protect habitats, wildlife and ancient woodlands. A Phase 1 habitat survey is a specific requirement of this site allocation policy.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities – including school places, medical facilities, transport, burial space in local church yard.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development.	No change.
Lack of amenities. Impact on quality of life. Impact on rural activities.	Strategic and detailed policies are in place to reduce the detrimental impacts of proposed development. Specific measures are included in CP5 Countryside to encourage rural activities.	New policy formulation to strengthen maintenance of rural character.
Inadequate infrastructure, including water supply.	Specific provision is being made to provide appropriate levels of physical infrastructure. Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Use brownfield first.	Existing Policy NPPF1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National	No change.

	Policy Planning Framework, which promotes the reuse of previously developed land.	
Detrimental impacts on historic and listed buildings. Impact on Otham which is part of a Conservation Area.	Strategic policies promote conservation and the protection of heritage and high quality environments. The site allocation policy includes specific criteria to preserve the setting of the listed Bicknor Farmhouse.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.
Pollution – including air quality concerns.	Air quality issues are covered by Criterion 8.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Coalescence with other settlements.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	No change.
Schools further than walking distance. No local employment opportunities.	Development proposed adjacent to existing built-up area which includes employment sites. Maidstone itself is a major employment centre.	No change.
Access via dedicated loop linked to Sutton Rd only with emergency and pedestrian access onto Gore Court Road and White Hose Lane.	Access is identified at the most appropriate locations for all modes, including for emergency services.	No change.
Eastern section should be protected.	Planning permission already granted which has taken account of ecological and biodiversity issues.	No change.
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.	If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (7)	North of Bicknor Wood, Gore Court Road, Otham	
Number of Support (0) / Object (38) / General Observations (0)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic (Downsword PC) /congestion. Highway capacity concerns (including at Otham village). Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian), including on rural lanes if increased traffic (Otham PC). Pressure on rural lanes. Poor local roads. Highway impacts (including HGV traffic concerns along Willington Street). Increased rat-running. Rural roads unsuitable for heavy traffic (Downsword PC). Additional train capacity needed. Lack of railway station / public transport. Lack of parking at train station. Impact on parking at St Nicholas church (Otham PC). Impact on cyclist / horses / pedestrians. Lack of traffic management survey (Otham PC). Cumulative impact on congestion and infrastructure. Collective impact of 2750 dwelling on SE edge of Maidstone on transport network unacceptable (Swale BC). Lack of evidence of transport assessments. Proposed road improvements inadequate.</p> <p>Access and egress from the south side of the town is subject to severe delays (Swale BC).</p> <p>Willington Street / A20 junction already at capacity. Willington Street / Wheatsheaf Junction unsuitable for increased traffic (Otham PC). No plans to improve roads and junctions east towards Hollingbourne. Solution is not a new road at Leeds/ Langley.</p> <p>Proposed alternative highway route via J8, removal of HGV traffic along Willington Street, 20mph speed limit and additional pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>Criterion 12 indicates the strategic transport requirements from potential developers in respect of Willington Street, including additional capacity and improvements in the area which will increase capacity. Transport Assessments required will address the cumulative impacts of proposals and consider</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	additional measures for road safety.	
Inadequate infrastructure (Downswood PC, Otham PC), including sewerage capacity, water supply.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Detrimental impacts on historic and listed buildings. Impact on rural setting and character of villages. Impact on rural character. Impact on Otham which is part of a Conservation Area and has a lack of shops and street lighting. Otham is unique in terms of the number of listed buildings, its topography and landscape setting. Loss of character to Downswood (Downswood PC). Impact on Grade 1 listed church (Downswood PC). Development out of character with listed church. Impact on heritage assets and character of Otham village (Otham PC). Located outside village boundary of Bearsted.	Specific impacts on historic and listed buildings and heritage matters are not specifically considered in this policy and this will be reviewed. Site located a considerable distance from Otham Church and Conservation Area.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.
Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities (Downswood PC, Otham PC) – including school places, medical facilities, transport, burial space in local church yard (Downswood PC, Otham PC), shops.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Lack of amenities. Impact on quality of life. Impact on rural activities (Downswood PC, Otham OC). Loss of views. Increase in anti- social behaviour. Impact on existing residents. Detrimental to the village area of Otham. Impact of route of public footpath KH131.	Strategic and detailed policies seek to reduce the detrimental impacts of proposed development which is located adjacent to existing settlements. Specific policies encourage rural activities.	New policy formulation to strengthen maintenance of rural character.
Density inappropriate for area. Development of Maidstone misconceived. Number of houses does not take into account already built homes. Quantum of development around Otham is inappropriate. Too much housing on one area. High number of houses compared to other areas. Housing numbers are out of scale with infrastructure. Many buildings stand empty in the town and there are brownfield sites – seems disproportionate to destroy small rural village .	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required and the implementation of national policy which seeks to increase housing densities to reduce land take required. The council’s SHEDLAA studies identify the most appropriate locations for proposed housing in terms of availability and	No change.

	feasibility and policies seek to increase the use of previously developed land.	
Loss of agricultural land/ greenfield land. Located in open countryside. Use brownfield first. Wrong to build on good quality farmland in food production. Detrimental to intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.	The site is predominantly Grade 3b (approx 65%) not classified as Best and Most Versatile land, with some grade 3a (20%) and Grade 2 (15%). However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable to enable development but this is kept to a minimum.	No change.
Detrimental to wildlife and habitats. Existing hedgerows must be retained. Impact on ancient woodland. Ecological constraints (Downswood PC).	Any proposed development will be subject to an ecological survey which will identify potential constraints.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Pollution – including air quality concerns. Deterioration of water quality in the River Len.	Pollution, including air quality, issues are covered by strategic and detailed policies related to the South-east strategic housing location.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Coalescence with other settlements / merging of surrounding villages. Development will swamp Otham and merge it into the urban sprawl of Maidstone.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.
Schools further than walking distance. No local employment opportunities.	Site allocations are mainly adjacent to existing settlements but it is accepted that in some cases this will mean schools are not within walking distance. Employment policies seek to promote employment opportunities throughout the borough. Maidstone itself is a major employment centre.	No change.
All new housing should be accessed from Sutton Road (Downswood PC). Access via dedicated loop linked to Sutton Rd only (Otham PC). Unsuitable access. Access through the site into H9 for public transport should be included. Do not understand link with spine road	Proposed access arrangements from Sutton Road have been subject to consultation with the highway authority and may link with the development site	No change.

in development H1 (6) which is stated only links with A274. Alarming proposal to connect to a spine road on H1 (6).		at Policy H1(6). (Criterion 6)	
Increased risk of flooding.		The site is not within floods zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (8)	West of Church Road, Otham		
Number of Support (1) / Object (44) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic (Downswood PC)/congestion. Highway capacity concerns (including at Otham village). Unsuitable road network. Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian), including on rural lanes of increased traffic (Otham PC). Pressure on rural lanes. Poor local roads. Highway impacts (including HGV traffic concerns along Willington Street). Increased rat-running. Rural roads unsuitable for		The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective	No change.

<p>heavy traffic (Downswood PC). Additional train capacity needed. Lack of railway station / public transport. Lack of parking at train station. Impact on parking at St Nicholas church (Otham PC). Impact on cyclist / horses / pedestrians. Lack of traffic management survey (Otham PC). Cumulative impact on congestion and infrastructure. Collective impact of 2750 dwelling on SE edge of Maidstone on transport network unacceptable (Swale BC). Lack of evidence of transport assessments. Proposed road improvements inadequate.</p> <p>Access and egress from the south side of the town is subject to severe delays (Swale BC).</p> <p>Willington Street / A20 junction already at capacity Willington Street / Wheatsheaf Junction unsuitable for increased traffic (Otham PC).</p> <p>Proposed alternative highway route via J8, removal of HGV traffic along Willington Street, 20mph speed limit and additional pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>Criterion 10 requires specific strategic transport improvements.</p> <p>No new route is proposed in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure (Downswood PC, Otham PC), including sewerage capacity, drainage.</p>	<p>Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p>
<p>Detrimental impacts on historic and listed buildings (including listed church in Otham). Impact on rural setting and character of villages. Impact on rural character. Impact on Otham which is part of a Conservation Area and has a lack of shops and street lighting. Otham is unique in terms of the number of listed buildings, its topography and landscape setting. Impact of character of Downswood (Downswood PC). Impact on Grade 1 listed church (Downswood PC). Development out of character with listed church. Impact on heritage assets and character of Otham village (Otham PC).</p>	<p>Criteria 3 and 4 require the setting of the listed St Nicholas Church to be taken into account. Otham Conservation Area is a significant distance from this site to the east.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.</p>
<p>Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities (Downswood PC, Otham PC) – including school places, medical facilities, public</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community</p>	<p>No change.</p>

services, hospital, burial space in local church yard (Downswood PC, Otham PC), shops.	infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	
Lack of amenities. Impact on quality of life. Impact on rural activities (Downswood PC, Otham PC). Loss of views. Increase in anti- social behaviour. Impact on existing residents. The screening proposed is not adequate. Impact on Chapman Avenue. 15m buffer should be extended to 50-100m to avoid overlooking.	Strategic and detailed policies seek to reduce the detrimental impacts of proposed development which is located adjacent to existing settlements.	New policy formulation to strengthen maintenance of rural character.
Coalescence with other settlements / merging of surrounding villages. Development will swamp Otham and merge it into the urban sprawl of Maidstone. At odds with spatial characteristics of Maidstone, will block the penetration of greenland into the centre. Loss of separation for Otham from Maidstone. Coalescence with Downswood.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area and secure appropriate green space. The site is situated at the edge of Maidstone and maintains separation between the town and the village of Otham.	No change.
Loss of agricultural land/ greenfield land. Unacceptable impact on countryside. Use brownfield first. Wrong to build on good quality farmland in food production. Loss of open space.	The site was classified as Grade 2 in the 1994 ALC survey. However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable to enable development but this is kept to a minimum. This has to be weighed against the fact that this is a sustainable site on the edge of the urban area.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.
Detrimental to wildlife (including skylark, pipistrelle bat, owl, grass snake and slow worm) and habitats. Loss of hedgerows. Existing hedgerows must be retained. Impact on ancient woodland. Ecological constraints (Downswood PC).	Any proposed development will be subject to an ecological survey which will identify potential constraints.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Pollution – noise, light and air quality concerns. Deterioration of water quality in the River Len.	Pollution, including air quality, issues are covered by strategic and detailed policies for the south-east strategic housing location.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.

<p>Density inappropriate for area. Overdevelopment. Development of Maidstone misconceived. Number of houses does not take into account already built homes. Quantum of development around Otham is inappropriate. Too much housing on one area. High number of houses compared to other areas. Housing numbers are out of scale with infrastructure. Many buildings stand empty in the town and there are brownfield sites – seems disproportionate to destroy small rural village. Infrastructure should be in place before development takes place. Large development at edge of urban boundary is contrary to NPPF. Yield should be reduced (Otham PC).</p>	<p>Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required (SHMA) and the implementation of national policy which seeks to increase housing densities to reduce land take required. The council’s SHEDLAA studies identify the most appropriate locations for proposed housing in terms of availability and feasibility and policies seek to increase the use of previously developed land. The draft Local Plan does indeed identify brownfield sites; more than 3,000 homes are planned on previously used land in the Maidstone urban area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Schools further than walking distance. No local employment opportunities. Site isolated from town centre.</p>	<p>Site allocations are mainly adjacent to existing settlements but it is accepted that in some cases this will mean schools are not within walking distance. Employment policies seek to promote employment opportunities throughout the borough. Maidstone itself is a major employment centre.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Access/egress from the estate would be a severe problem. All new housing should be accessed from Sutton Road (Downswood PC). Otham access via dedicated loop linked to Sutton Rd only (Otham OC). Unsuitable access. No mention of pedestrian access into Woolley Road and this would provide access to a high quality bus service. Widening Church Road between the development and Derringwood Drove would give an opportunity for a bus service link to the area with Downswood and Madginford. Access would be a stumbling block at the very badly laid out Willington Street-</p>	<p>Proposed access arrangements and highway measures from Sutton Road have been subject to consultation with the highway authority.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Derringwood Drive Junction. Consideration should be given to access via Woolley Road / access via Wooley Road only (Otham PC).			
Increased risk of flooding.		The site is not within floods zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Houses in the Chapman Avenue valley have already been subject to subsidence and further pressure on the land above and its effect on the water table could exacerbate the problem.		Neither the Environment Agency or Southern Water have raised concerns in connection with this site.	No change.
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (9)	Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road, Otham		
Number of Support (1) / Object (52) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic (Downswood PC) /congestion. Highway capacity concerns (including at Otham village). Unsuitable road network. Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian), including rural lanes		The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks	No change.

<p>if increased traffic (Otham PC). Pressure on rural lanes. Poor local roads. Highway impacts (including HGV traffic concerns along Willington Street). Increased rat-running (including Otham lanes). Rural roads unsuitable for heavy traffic (Downswood PC). Additional train capacity needed. Lack of railway station / public transport. Lack of parking at train station. Impact on parking at St Nicholas church (Otham PC). Lack of motorway links. Impact on cyclist / horses / pedestrians. Lack of traffic management survey (Otham PC) / agreed Local Transport Plan/ transport strategy Concern about cumulative impact on infrastructure. Collective impact of 2750 dwelling on SE edge of Maidstone on transport network unacceptable (Swale BC). Cumulative impact on congestion and infrastructure (Langley PC). Lack of evidence of transport assessments.</p> <p>Access and egress from the south side of the town is subject to severe delays (Swale BC).</p> <p>Willington Street / A20 junction already at capacity. No plans to improve roads and junctions east towards Hollingbourne. Improvements proposed are inadequate. Willington Street / Wheatsheaf Junction unsuitable for increased traffic (Otham PC).</p> <p>Solution is not a new road at Leeds/Langley.</p> <p>Bus priority measures are unworkable and undeliverable (Langley PC).</p> <p>Proposed alternative highway route via J8, removal of HGV traffic along Willington Street, 20mph speed limit and additional pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>Criterion 12 requires specific strategic transport improvements.</p> <p>No new route is proposed in the Local Plan. Consultation has taken place with Arriva with regard to deliverability of bus improvements.</p> <p>No new route is proposed in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure (Downswood PC, Otham PC), including sewerage capacity. Impact on infrastructure. Concern about</p>	<p>Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p>

cumulative impact on infrastructure (Langley PC).	to ensure adequate provision..	
Detrimental impacts on historic and listed buildings (including listed church in Otham). Impact on rural setting and character of villages. Impact on rural character and character of built form. Impact on Otham which is part of a Conservation Area and has a lack of shops and street lighting. Otham is unique in terms of the number of listed buildings, its topography and landscape setting. Langley will lose its village status. Loss of character of Downswood (Downswood PC). Impact on Grade 1 listed church (Downswood PC). Impact on heritage assets and character of Otham Village (Otham PC).	Specific impacts on historic and listed buildings, and heritage matters are considered in Criterion 3.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.
Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities (Downswood PC, Otham PC) – including school places, medical facilities, public services, transport, hospital, burial space in local church yard (Downswood PC, Otham PC), shops. Concern about cumulative impact on infrastructure (Langley PC).	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Lack of amenities (including Langley). Impact on quality of life. Impact on rural activities (Downswood PC, Otham PC). Loss of views. Increase in anti- social behaviour.	Strategic and detailed policies seek to reduce the detrimental impacts of proposed development which is located adjacent to existing settlements. Specific policies encourage rural activities.	No change.
Increased urban sprawl (KCC). Coalescence of Langley with urban area (Langley PC). Coalescence with surrounding villages / merging of Maidstone Urban area with other settlements (KCC). Development will swamp Otham and merge it into the urban sprawl of Maidstone.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	No change.
Loss of agricultural land/ greenfield land/ open countryside (KCC). Unacceptable impact on countryside. Use brownfield first. Wrong to build on good quality farmland in food production.	It is acknowledged that some of the proposed development site was classified as Grade 1 with the remainder Grade 3a, in the 1994 ALC survey. However the majority of the Grade 1 is area lies to the east of the site which has been excluded from the area proposed for development	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.

	as shown on the amended Proposals Map. However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable to enable development but this has been kept to a minimum.	
Detrimental to wildlife (including skylark) and habitats. Loss of hedgerows. Existing hedgerows must be retained. Impact on ancient woodland. Hedgerow along Sutton Road should not be removed. Ecological constraints (Downswood PC).	Any proposed development will be subject to an ecological survey which will identify potential constraints.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Pollution – noise and air quality concerns. Deterioration of water quality in the River Len.	Pollution, including air quality, issues are covered by strategic and detailed policies for the South-east strategic housing location.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Density inappropriate for area. Overdevelopment. Development of Maidstone misconceived. Number of houses does not take into account already built homes. Quantum of development around Otham is inappropriate. Too much housing on one area. High number of houses compared to other areas. Housing numbers are out of scale with infrastructure. Many buildings stand empty in the town and there are brownfield sites – seems disproportionate to destroy small rural village.	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required and the implementation of national policy which seeks to increase housing densities to reduce land take required. The council's SHEDLAA studies identify the most appropriate locations for proposed housing in terms of availability and feasibility and policies seek to increase the use of previously developed land.	No change.
Unsustainable development not in accordance with Langley Parish Plan. Site is located on the urban periphery of Maidstone and is removed from the services and infrastructure of the town centre (KCC). More than 3 miles from town centre (KCC). Will be reliant on car based transport, exacerbated by the distance to appropriate retail, employment, recreation and social infrastructure (KCC). Distance from services, facilities, transport infrastructure and employment. Where are the employers. Unsustainable location. Schools further than walking distance. No local employment opportunities.	Policy SP1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. Transport Assessment will be required which will indicate the impacts of proposed development in terms of transport and access issues. Employment policy EMP1 seeks to protect and enhance employment opportunities. Maidstone	No change.

		itself is a major employment centre.	
All new housing should be accessed from Sutton Road (Downswood PC). Otham access via dedicated loop linked to Sutton Rd only (Otham PC). Site should have access, at least for public transport, with H1(7).		Proposed access arrangements from Sutton Road have been subject to consultation with the highway authority.	No change.
Increased risk of flooding. A274 flooding will be exacerbated.		The site is not within floods zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Increase dwelling from 335 – 635 (John Bishop and Associates).		Increase not appropriate due to impact on the setting of Rumwood Court.	No change.
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address the deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (10)	South of Sutton Road, Langley		
Number of Support (2) / Object (47) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic (Downswood PC)/congestion. Highway capacity concerns (including at Otham village). Unsuitable road network. Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian) Including on rural		The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks	No change.

<p>lanes if increased traffic (Otham PC). Pressure on rural lanes. Poor local roads. Lack of footpaths. Highway impacts (including HGV traffic concerns along Willington Street). Increased rat-running (including Otham lanes). Rural roads unsuitable for heavy traffic (Downswood PC). Additional train capacity needed. Lack of railway station / public transport. Lack of parking at train station. Impact on parking at St Nicholas church (Otham PC). Lack of motorway links. Impact on cyclist / horses / pedestrians. Lack of traffic management survey (Otham PC)/ agreed Local Transport Plan/ transport strategy (Langley PC). Cumulative impact on congestion and infrastructure (Langley PC). Collective impact of 2750 dwelling on SE edge of Maidstone on transport network unacceptable (Swale BC).</p> <p>Bus priority measures are unworkable and undeliverable (Langley PC).</p> <p>Access and egress from the south side of the town is subject to severe delays (Swale BC).</p> <p>Willington Street / A20 junction already at capacity. No plans to improve roads and junctions east towards Hollingbourne. Improvements proposed are inadequate. Willington Street / Wheatsheaf Junction unsuitable for increased traffic (Otham PC).</p> <p>Solution is not a new road at Leeds/Langley.</p> <p>Proposed alternative highway route via J8, removal of HGV traffic along Willington Street, 20mph speed limit and additional pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>Consultation has taken place with Arriva with regard to deliverability of bus improvements.</p> <p>Criterion 12 requires specific strategic transport improvements.</p> <p>No new route is proposed in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure (Downswood PC, Otham PC), including sewerage capacity and water supply. Concern about cumulative impact on infrastructure (Langley PC).</p>	<p>Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Insert new criteria to state:</p>

<p>There is insufficient capacity in the existing sewerage network to accommodate this development. Due to the size of the development, significant new or improved infrastructure would be required to serve it. Developers are advised to work with Southern Water to identify solutions. Development proposals will need to demonstrate that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is either available, or can be delivered in parallel with the development (Southern Water).</p>	<p>The Council must ensure that specific provision is made in the policy and subsequent planning decisions to ensure appropriate levels of infrastructure are provided in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Development proposals will demonstrate that any necessary new or improved foul and surface water drainage infrastructure required to serve the development, to ensure no risk of flooding off-site has been delivered, or will be delivered in parallel with the development in consultation with the Environment Agency, Southern Water and the Borough Council.</p>
<p>Detrimental impacts on historic and listed buildings (including listed church in Otham). Impact on rural setting and character of villages. Impact on rural character and character of built form. Impact on Otham which is part of a Conservation Area and has a lack of shops and street lighting. Otham is unique in terms of the number of listed buildings, its topography and landscape setting. Langley will lose its village status. Loss of character of Downswood (Downswood PC). Impact on Grade 1 listed church (Downswood PC). Impact on heritages assets and character of Otham village (Otham PC).</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area Criterion 3 requires the preservation of the setting of the listed buildings surrounding the site.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen heritage and rural character protection.</p>
<p>Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities (Downswood PC, Otham PC) – including school places, medical facilities, public services, transport, hospital, burial space in local church yard (Downswood PC, Otham PC). Concern about cumulative impact on infrastructure (Langley PC).</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Lack of amenities (including Langley). Impact on quality of life. Impact on rural activities (Downswood PC, Otham PC). Views in general not impacted. Loss of views. Increase in anti- social behaviour.</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies seek to reduce the detrimental impacts of proposed development which is located adjacent to existing settlements. Specific policies encourage rural activities.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen rural character protection.</p>
<p>Increased urban sprawl. Coalescence of Langley with urban area</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies for the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>(Langley PC). Coalescence with surrounding villages / coalescence of Maidstone urban area with other settlements (KCC). Development will swamp Otham and merge it into the urban sprawl of Maidstone.</p>	<p>protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area</p>	
<p>Loss of agricultural land/ greenfield land / Open countryside (KCC). Unacceptable impact on countryside (Swale BC). Use brownfield first. Wrong to build on good quality farmland in food production.</p>	<p>The agricultural land on this site has been classified as Grade 3b which does not fall into the Best and Most Versatile category. A significant proportion of the site is not in agricultural use.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and maintenance of rural character.</p>
<p>Detrimental to wildlife (including skylark) and habitats. Loss of hedgerows. Ecological constraints (Downswood PC).</p>	<p>Any proposed development will be subject to an ecological survey which will identify potential constraints.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.</p>
<p>Pollution – noise and air quality concerns. Deterioration of water quality in the River Len.</p>	<p>Pollution, including air quality, issues are covered by strategic and detailed policies for the South-east strategic housing location.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen air quality.</p>
<p>Density inappropriate for area. Overdevelopment. Development of Maidstone misconceived. Number of houses does not take into account already built homes. Quantum of development around Otham is inappropriate. Too much housing on one area. High number of houses compared to other areas. Premature at this stage in time. Housing numbers are out of scale with infrastructure.</p> <p>Without phasing of sites to ensure transport and community infrastructure is in place, this housing development is overload.</p>	<p>Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required (SHMA) and the implementation of national policy. The council’s SHEDLAA studies identify the most appropriate locations for proposed housing in terms of availability and feasibility and policies seek to increase the use of previously developed land. The draft Local Plan does indeed identify brownfield sites; more than 3,000 homes are planned on previously used land in the Maidstone urban area. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities.</p> <p>Section 106 agreements will ensure infrastructure is in place to serve the development. This can include trigger points for infrastructure provision where justified.</p>	
<p>Unsustainable development not in accordance with Langley Parish Plan. Sustainable location. Site is located on the urban periphery of Maidstone and is removed from the services and infrastructure of the town centre (KCC). More than 3 miles from town centre (KCC). Will be reliant on car based transport, exacerbated by the distance to appropriate retail, employment, recreation and social infrastructure (KCC). Distance from services, facilities, transport infrastructure and employment. Where are the employers. Unsustainable location.</p>	<p>Existing Policy NPPF1 requires the council to ensure that proposed development is sustainable, in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. Transport Assessment will be required which will indicate the impacts of proposed development in terms of transport and access issues. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location at the edge of Maidstone with its attendant services and facilities. Employment policy EMP1 seeks to protect and enhance employment opportunities and Maidstone itself is a major employment centre.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>All new housing should be accessed from Sutton Road (Downswood PC). Otham access via dedicated loop linked to Sutton Rd only (Otham PC), with emergency and pedestrian access onto Gore Court Road and White Horse Lane. Access points need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Proposed access arrangements from Sutton Road have been subject to consultation with the highway authority.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Increased risk of flooding. A274 flooding will be exacerbated.</p>	<p>The site is not within floods zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	
Mixed scheme with Park and Ride should be developed here.		The current Park and Ride Strategy is to provide additional capacity to the north and south of the town.	No change.
Langley Loch should be protected.		Noted. Langley Loch is outside the proposed development area.	No change.
Other than developer contributions it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund necessary offsite infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address a deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (11)	Springfield, Royal Engineers Road and Mill Lane, Maidstone.		
Number of Support (2) / Object (34) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic /congestion (including A299). Impact on parking facilities. Highway safety concerns. Impact on local roads / increased rat-running. Road system will not cope. Cumulative highway impacts not fully assessed. Impact of traffic on already busy roads.		The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with the highway authority and will continue in	No change.

	the course of the current planning application. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.	
Object to loss of employment generating site. Further consideration needed as to whether it is appropriate to lose the entire site to housing (KCC). Should be mixed use. Excellent site for residential and should not be changed to allow for retail. Appropriate for employment and retail as it is a sustainable site on a main arterial route. Should be retained as a campus style employment site. Suitable for mixed use.	In view of the scale of the need for housing, 100% residential development is being proposed for this site.	No change.
Pollution – noise and air quality concerns.	Air quality mitigation measures will be required from proposed development on this site; noise will be considered.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Impact on local services and facilities – including medical facilities, social services, school and refuse collection. Community facilities must come forward early in the plan period and not await the Invicta Barracks development.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Proposed number / density of dwellings too high. Increased density of development. Too much housing on top of deprived area. Reduce to 650 dwellings (KCC) / 500 dwellings. These are not brownfield sites – use Powerhub site instead. Need a new community elsewhere. Perhaps a lower number of dwellings would be appropriate as part of a mixed use scheme (KCC).	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required (SHMA) and the implementation of national policy. After further review, it is proposed that the capacity of this site be reduced from 950 dwellings to 500.	Amend site capacity to 500 dwellings.
Detrimental to wildlife and habitats. Would destroy habitat of Great Crested Newt, Slow Worms, Grass Snakes and a range of protected bird and bat species. Ecology criteria not clear. Loss of trees.	Any proposed development will be subject to an ecological survey which will identify potential constraints.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Inadequate infrastructure, including sewerage, water supply and power.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.

<p>There is insufficient capacity in the existing sewerage network to accommodate this development. Due to the size of the development, significant new or improved infrastructure would be required to serve it. Developers are advised to work with Southern Water to identify solutions. Development proposals will need to demonstrate that the necessary sewerage infrastructure is either available, or can be delivered in parallel with the development (Southern Water).</p>	<p>to ensure adequate provision.</p> <p>The Council must ensure that specific provision is made in the policy and subsequent planning decisions to ensure appropriate levels of infrastructure are provided in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Insert new criterion to state: Development proposals will demonstrate that any necessary new or improved foul and surface water drainage infrastructure required to serve the development, to ensure no risk of flooding off-site has been delivered, or will be delivered in parallel with the development in consultation with Southern Water and the Borough Council.</p>
<p>Loss of flood storage. Flood meadows to north need protecting. Flooding criteria not clear.</p>	<p>Criterion 7 requires appropriate surface and flood water mitigation measures to be implemented, including SUDs.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Area of Local Landscape Importance should be protected. Local landscape not mentioned. Absence of policy protection for green spaces.</p>	<p>Addressed under Policy SP5.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.</p>
<p>Detrimental to amenity value of area. Impact on town centre. Reduced rural aspect. The allocation of 2,460 dwellings in a confined area will result in town cramming and loss of character.</p>	<p>Criteria 1 and 3 require the special nature of the site to be respected in proposed development scheme.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Unclear if access is intended from the southern roundabout (by the Library) as well as the roundabout which currently accesses Invicta Barracks. Pedestrian access to just north of the northbound bus stop on Royal Engineers Road and the pedestrian crossing pedestrian crossing would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Access is intended to be taken from both roundabouts as per Criterion 4.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Policy Number H1 (12)</p>	<p>Site Name Haynes, Ashford Road, Maidstone</p>	
<p>Number of Support (2) / Object (11) / General Observations (1)</p>		

Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Negative impacts from traffic in terms of congestion and pollution. Not enough roads space for cycle links. Junction improvements required. Impact on parking facilities. Highway safety concerns, including pedestrian. Sufficient parking must be provided. No offsite parking available. Pedestrian crossings will exacerbate congestion.		Criterion 8 requires improvements to pedestrian and cycle links.	No change.
Reconsider density. Lower density required. Cramped development. Reduce to 40 dwellings per hectare.		Agreed. Amend site capacity from 250 to 200 dwellings.	Amend site capacity to 200 dwellings.
Pollution concerns – noise, air quality, land contamination. Risk of ground pollution.		Air quality mitigation measures will be required from proposed development on this site together with noise and land contamination surveys. (Criteria 3, 4 and 5.)	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Pressure on local services and facilities, including school, health facilities. Open space provision required. No public open space available. Idea of off-site contributions not acceptable.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation top strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Flatted multi-storey development would be out of character. Site not suitable for housing.		The style of proposed development is not specified; policy only requires high density for a town centre location.	No change
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (13)	Medway Street, Maidstone		
Number of Support (1) / Object (1) / General Observations			

Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Pollution and noise make this site unsuitable.		Appropriate noise and air pollution mitigation measures will be required in the development of this previously developed town centre site.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Too small to accommodate sufficient residential units and associated parking.		This site is regarded as suitable for high density housing in a town centre location.	No change.
Site should be used for employment uses.		No interest has been expressed for employment use.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1(14)	American Golf, Tonbridge Road, Maidstone		
Number of Support (3) / Object (1)/ General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Density too high; should be lower.		The proposed density is considered appropriate for this centrally located urban site.	No change.
Green corridor along Medway Valley should be protected.		This is a brownfield site suitable for infill development in a town centre location. Appropriate open space will be provided during implementation.	No change.
High density scheme, coupled with McDonalds development will lead to congestion – how will air quality be improved?		Appropriate air quality mitigation measures as specified in criterion 4 will be required during implementation of this brownfield site.	No change.
Adjoining land at 3 Tonbridge Road should be included (developer).		This site has been considered in the latest Call for Sites.	No change
Policy Number	Site Name		

H1 (15)	6 Tonbridge Road, Maidstone	
Number of Support (1) / Object / General Observations (1)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Concerned about visual and architectural design.	New strategic policy will require high visual and architectural design quality.	New policy formulation to strengthen requirement for high quality design.
Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (16)	Laguna, Hart Street, Maidstone	
Number of Support (1) / Object (1) / General Observations (2)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased risk of flooding. What flood controls are in place?	Criterion 7 requires appropriate surface and flood water mitigation measures to be implemented, including SUDs.	No change.
Support development of brownfield site.	Noted.	No change.
How will air quality be improved.	Criterion 4 requires that air quality mitigation measures be implemented as part of proposed development.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
There are already a large number of residences in Hart Street and Clifford Way which have only one means of access - Hart Street. This could lead to serious safety issues, especially if a future flooding event exceeds the levels experienced in December 2013.	We have had not had a Kent Highways or Environment Agency objection to this development.	
Medway path should be retained and enhanced (Natural England).	This will be secured as part of criterion 8 of the policy.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (17)	Barty Farm, Roundwell, Thurnham	

Number of Support (2) / Object (45) / General Observations (0)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic / congestion. Additional traffic through Bearsted on a dangerous stretch of road. Impact on footpath. No space for a footpath. Local road infrastructure unsuitable. Highway impacts. Increased rat-running.</p> <p>Improvements to vehicle and cycle parking at Bearsted railway station have been sought for many years and none has been forthcoming.</p>	<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>At the application stage the Council can seek a contribution to enhancement of parking at Bearsted Railway Station.</p>	No change.
<p>Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities, particularly school and health facilities.</p> <p>Affordable housing in this commercial development would not be reserved for people with local connections.</p>	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
<p>Concerns about vehicle access to the site. Access too narrow. Dangerous access. Alternative access arrangements being explored (Hobbs Parker).</p>	The Highways Authority has not raised objections to this allocation. It is noted that the site's agents are exploring alternative accesses.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure. Impact on local infrastructure.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.

	to ensure adequate provision.	
Detrimental to amenities enjoyed by existing residents. Impact on existing residents. Visual intrusion.	Amenity issues dealt with under Criterion 1 and at detailed planning stage.	No change.
Harm to setting of AONB / countryside. Harm to character and appearance of the countryside and SLA. Landscape impact. Site is removed from the urban area. Controlled lighting and no street lighting would help conserve dark skies (AONB Unit).	Further work is being done on policies for protection of countryside and designated areas. This site is however, considered to be sufficiently separated and screened from Kent Down AONB (which lies to the north of the M20 motorway), by existing features in the landscape. Development does not extend northwards beyond the Maidstone-East to Ashford railway line.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Loss of agricultural land / greenfield land / countryside. Brownfield sites should be prioritised.	The site is approximately 66% grade 2 and 33% grade 3a land. However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable to enable development but this is kept to a minimum and this has to be weighed against the location of the development on the edge of the existing urban area.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Road floods. Water Lane is prone to flooding and development of fields will make this more likely. Road floods at Lilk Meadows.	The EA has not objected to the allocation of this site. The site is not within flood zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Impact on rural / village character. Traffic increase will have an impact on historic properties. Loss of a house and / or listed wall. Impact on setting of listed Barty House.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	Insert new criterion to state: The development proposals are designed to take into account the results of a detailed Heritage Impact

	It is agreed that a further criterion should be added to this specific site policy relating to heritage impacts.	Assessment that addresses the impact of the development on the character and setting of the designated heritage assets adjacent to the site.
Loss of habitats.	Consideration will be further policy and Criterion 4 requires an ecological survey.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Increased pollution. Noise and pollution associated with construction traffic.	Appropriate air pollution mitigation measures will be required in the development of this previously developed town centre site. Some temporary nuisance is inevitable during the construction period.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Urban sprawl. Significant expansion of village envelope.	This site on the edge of the urban area is bounded by existing residential dwellings on two sides.	No change.
Existing over-development of Bearsted area. Parkwood and Detling Airfield should be considered as alternatives. Part of KIG site and development rejected previously. Propose under-utilised coal yard by the station for development. Deliverability questioned.	This is regarded as a limited expansion of an existing settlement; sites are identified following a 'call for sites' which indicates availability for development. Detling Airfield is in the Kent Downs AONB.	No change.
Policy Number H1 (18)	Site Name Whitmore Street, Maidstone	
Number of Support (1) / Object (1) / General Observations (0)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Density too low, yield should be increased from 5 – 15 (Wealden Homes)	In view of the characteristics and location of this small site, a net density of 45dph is considered appropriate.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name	

H1 (19)	North Street, Barming	
Number of Support (1) / Object (18) / General Observations (0)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Increased traffic/ congestion. This development will create additional traffic in Hermitage Lane and, if one or more of the developments off Hermitage Lane does not occur, suggest there should be a contribution to the Hermitage Lane/ Heath Road and/or A20 Hermitage Lane junctions. Policy should address implication of development for A26. Pedestrian safety concerns. Highway impacts.</p> <p>The northern section of North Street is particularly narrow, just wide enough for the local bus to get through. We already experience rat running by vehicle short cutting between the A26 and Hermitage Lane, a problem that has noticeably increased since the hospital opened, causing serious safety issues for cyclists and dog walkers as well as local residents. Any Section 106 agreement must allow for traffic calming / traffic management measures.</p> <p>Assessment of capacity of A26 is required (Wateringbury PC).</p>	<p>The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process. Full consultations have taken place with transport undertakings to ensure the most appropriate provision of facilities, including parking. The Local Plan seeks to promote alternatives to private car use wherever possible.</p> <p>A number of traffic impact assessments have already been completed in connection with planning applications in this area and comprehensive strategic transport modelling for the whole of the urban area is in progress.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land (Barming PC). Loss of countryside/ green corridor.</p>	<p>The site was classified as Grade 2 in the 1994 ALC survey. The proposals map should be modified to clarify the extent of the area proposed for development. However, some loss of agricultural land is inevitable to enable development but this is kept to a minimum on this site through</p>	<p>Amend Proposals Map to make it clear that only the frontage of the site to North Street is suitable for development.</p>

	the clarification of the area to be developed.	
Urbanising effect on rural area. Loss of semi-rural character of Barming. Coalescence.	Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	New policy formulation to strengthen rural character protection.
Pressure on local services and facilities, including the school, doctors' surgery and lack of dental surgery.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Pollution. Air quality impacts, including Hermitage Lane / Tonbridge Road Junction.	Appropriate air pollution mitigation measures will be required in the development of this site.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Sensitive location which should not be developed. Should be protected at part of Medway valley. Site unsuitable for development (Barming PC).	This site is regarded as appropriate for road frontage development only and the site plan will be amended to make this clearer.	Amend site plan to more clearly define the actual developable area of the site.
Impact on ecological value of site. Biodiversity importance. No further loss of ancient woodland should be allowed.	No ancient woodland on site. The proposal is for frontage development only which limits the likely ecological impacts.	No change .
Too much housing proposed for the Barming area. There has been no consultation on moving the urban boundary. The easterly part is the more urban edge of Maidstone. North Street is the rural edge of Maidstone, particularly where it slopes up towards North Pole Road and faces the valuable local landscape / farmland area towards Teston. Additional housing here would be inappropriate and would urbanise this rural edge.	This site is regarded as appropriate for road frontage development only. The policy requires the design of development to respect the site's semi-rural location.	No change.
Non-developable land needs clarifying. Will create pressure to develop the rest of the site. The whole site should be allocated for development (Pegasus Group).	The redrawn boundary clarifies the developable area.	Amend site plan to more clearly define the actual developable area of the site
Concerns about vehicle access to the site and street lighting. Access	North Street is two-way and access	No change.

onto a single track rural lane (Barming PC). Criteria should include highway access appraisals (Wateringbury PC).		arrangements have the agreement of KCC Highways.	
Inadequate infrastructure. Consider cumulative impact of development on infrastructure.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (20)	Postley Road, Tovil		
Number of Support / Object (8) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic/congestion. Development is outside the comfortable walking distance to the nearest all day bus service, on Loose Road. Together with recent developments in the southern end of Postley Road there may be sufficient population to justify, at least, an off peak service that would require pump priming.		Some increase in traffic generation is inevitable. The site is within reasonable walking distance of bus routes to the north.	No change.
Impact on countryside/loss of green space. Should be left as a green corridor alongside the footpath. Loss of green wedge. Loss of greenfield site of local importance. Site provides an attractive interface between the Loose Valley and urban area and should be protected. Impact on countryside setting of Loose Valley.		This is a greenfield site and design and layout criteria will be applied to ensure a high quality development. Open space will be provided as part of proposed development.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Urban sprawl. Site provides relief from continuous built development. Creep of development into the countryside.		This site is an extension of the built-up area.	No change.
Detrimental to wildlife. Receptor site for translocated wildlife. Relocation of slow worms and common lizards to the adjacent nature reserve took place after the ecological survey for this site – possible migration onto this site.		An ecological survey will be required (criterion 6) prior to any proposed development and any constraints identified.	No change.
Concerns about vehicle access.		Access is only possible onto Postley Road.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.

Residents will use cars to access services.		Strategic policies in the Local Plan seek to promote the use of alternatives to the private car wherever possible.	No change.
Proposed density too high because of proximity to Conservation Area and listed building Hayle Manor.		The proposed density is considered appropriate to the scale of existing development adjacent. Criterion 1 of the policy seeks the address the heritage impact.	No change.
Impact on views from existing properties.		Individual views are not a material consideration for planning policy.	No change.
Incorrectly defined as rough grassland.		This is considered to be a reasonable description of the current site state.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (21)	Kent Police HQ, Sutton Road, Maidstone		
Number of Support (2) / Object (2) / General Observations			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Impacts on congestion.		Noted. KCC Highways has not objected to the site allocation and the site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission.	No change.
Other than developers' financial contributions, it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund the necessary off-site infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address and deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes.	No change.
'Earthwork' may be a heritage / landscape asset (Natural England).		The site is subject to a resolution to grant planning permission. Agreed conditions will protect appearance and setting of the	No change.

		development. Reserved matters include a. Layout b. Scale c. Appearance d. Access e. Landscaping.	
All elements welcomed.		Noted.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1(22)	Kent Police Training School, Sutton Road, Maidstone		
Number of Support (2) / Object (3) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Poor air quality in the area. Proposed transport measures will not mitigate the delays experienced when travelling on local roads.		This site is now subject to a resolution to grant consent.	No change.
Other than developers' financial contributions, it is unclear how the balance of funding will be found to fund the necessary off-site infrastructure.		If development generates additional demand / need that cannot be accommodated, appropriate contributions will be secured from the development to address and deficit. Infrastructure providers have their own investment programmes. In relation to this specific site, infrastructure requirements have been addressed through the recent planning application.	No change.
Object in principle to the allocation of sports fields for housing development.		This site is subject to a resolution to grant planning permission. A Sport England objection to the application was considered, but did not warrant refusal. Although a net loss there will be replacement pitches on the Kent Police HQ site.	No change.
All elements welcomed.		Noted.	No change.

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (23)	New Line Learning, Boughton Lane, Loose	
Number of Support (0) / Object (15) / General Observations (1)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Will add to traffic pressures on Postley Road and the A229. Pressure on Boughton Lane which has too much traffic already. Highway safety concerns and parking issues associated with the development of Hayle Park. Boughton Lane junction cannot be improved. This development is at least 900metres from either the A274 or the A229 and is of insufficient size to support a bus service. Pedestrian access needs to be provided to link as directly as possible with either of these roads. Highway impacts.	A certain amount of extra traffic on Boughton Lane will be inevitable but is not regarded as excessive. Access for pedestrians and cycles will be made to existing footpaths on the boundaries of the site.	No change.
Narrow access is unsuitable. Access is unacceptable.	Boughton Lane is regarded as a suitable access by the highway authority.	No change.
Impact on character and appearance of locality. Conservation Area Impacts. Together with H1(5) and H1(47) this will surround Boughton Monchelsea with development. Loss of village identity.	Criterion 1 requires that the semi-rural nature of the area be complemented by future development.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.
Lack of local services and facilities. Object in principle to the allocation of sports fields for development. If there is a requirement to provide alternative playing fields then the development should not take place and the provision remains in situ. Education land should be protected.	The site is located in Maidstone which, as the borough's main town, is the most sustainable location for new development. Sport England raised objections to the recent planning application but these were resolved as the application progressed. Loss of existing playing fields was not one of the reasons for refusal.	No change.
Impact on ancient woodland adjacent– proximity to woodland may cause damage or potential loss. Ancient woodland not shown on the plan.	Criterion 6 notes the presence of a designated area of ancient woodland (Five Acre Wood) and the need for a landscaped buffer to be planted following	No change.

		a detailed survey.	
Impact on countryside.		Existing Policy SP5 identifies the significance of countryside throughout the Borough and the need to mitigate the impacts of development on the appearance and character of the landscape.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Urban sprawl. Site will close an important gap in the urban area.		Strategic and detailed policies for the protection of the countryside seek to prevent the coalescence of villages and maintain the rural character of the area.	No change.
Air pollution impact cannot be adequately mitigated.		Appropriate air pollution mitigation measures will be required in the development of this site.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (24)	West of Eclipse, Maidstone		
Number of Support (2) / Object (19) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Detrimental to wildlife and habitats. Site has been cleared – should be preserved as semi-natural heath for leisure uses. Biodiverse site with important habitats. Proposal would damage Heath Wood. Impact on ancient woodland. 15 metre buffer suggested.		Further work being undertaken on habitats and wildlife issues which will provide guidance for designated areas and to prospective developers to maintain biodiversity. In relation to this specific site, the policy requires an ecological survey and a landscape buffer to Heath Wood.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Impact on countryside. Loss of open fields. Impact on foreground to AONB, impact on setting on AONB. Development criteria do not adequately safeguard proximity to AONB or ancient Heath Wood. Extension of development into countryside. Impact on ancient		In the context of the built and permitted development on adjacent sites, it is considered that this site is capable of accommodating the development	No change.

woodland.	proposed without unacceptable additional impact on the setting of the AONB and the wider countryside.	
Increased traffic. Much development recently on Eclipse Park. Impact on parking facilities. Highway impacts.	The council takes full account of the traffic and transport implications of any proposed development and seeks contributions for highway and other appropriate improvements from the highway authority and prospective developers; as an intrinsic element of the development management process.	No change.
Pollution impacts – air, litter, noise.	Appropriate air pollution mitigation measures are dealt with by Criteria 6 and 7.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Pressure on local services and facilities, including school, GP surgery, refuse collection.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Overhead electricity lines – question whether people would get mortgages.	Noted.	No change.
Access off the Old Sittingbourne Road is difficult and leads to delays.	Recent highway improvements have increased options to access the site.	No change.
Would lower the value of existing homes – derelict and empty properties should be put back into use before new development occurs.	There is no evidence that the provision of new housing reduces general value levels. Policies seek to promote the reuse of previously developed land and properties.	No change.
Ideal location. Increase yield to 55 dwellings.	Noted.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name	

H1 (25)	Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham.	
Number of Support (0) / Object (29) / General Observations (2)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Ecological importance. Detrimental to wildlife and habitats. Irreversible damage to biodiversity. Designated receptor site for translocated wildlife from other development and has Slow Worms and Great Crested Newts. Ponds should be protected.	The policy requires a phase 1 ecological study to be undertaken. The receptor site issue is being addressed through the determination of the current planning application.	No change.
Impact on setting of AONB. Impact on AONB. Site has significant landscape features that make it unsuitable for development. We would request these are included in the development criteria, covering : lighting, sufficient internal open space and improved GI, developer contributions to the maintenance of boundaries and PRoW in the adjacent KDAONB (AONB Unit). Recent decisions (incl Ware Street, Thurnham and Court Lodge Road, Harrietsham) demonstrate MBC's commitment to protect and conserve the setting of the AONB. Visual amenity from the Downs across to Greensand Ridge will be harmed.	The policy requires the submission of a landscape survey which would address the impacts development could have on the setting of the AONB. The impact of lighting would be considered in detail as part of the planning application process.	No change.
Loss of publicly accessible open space. Loss of greenfield land / green space. Loss of countryside and open space for amenity. No more development served off West Street. Suggest land to the west be retained as open space. It provides the start of the barrier between rural and urban. It has already been eroded by an existing development below the station and the extensive infill will swamp the area and erode the edges of the existing village envelope.	Some loss of open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies. The policy requires a landscape buffer along the site's western boundary to help mitigate the landscape impact of development.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Increased traffic. West Street constrained.	A certain amount of extra traffic on West Street will be inevitable but is not regarded as excessive. KCC Highways has not objected to the allocation of this site.	No change.

Concerns about vehicle access to the site.	Vehicle access issues to the site will be determined at the detailed application stage. KCC Highways has not objected to the allocation of this site.	No change.
Emerging Neighbourhood Plan does not wish to see this site developed, other development underway is impacting on visual amenity. Constraints and infrastructure required ignore the emerging neighbourhood plan.	The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Overhead electric cables.	Detailed design of proposed development will need to take account of the presence of overhead cables.	No change.
Density too high. Development of this site would further expand the village envelope.	Harrietsham has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Harrietsham. The overall proposed site capacity is considered appropriate taking into account the density of development in Harrietsham itself, the characteristics of the site and the need to make efficient use of land. It is noted that the current application is for 5 more dwellings taking the total to 105.	No change.
The development of the Tongs Meadow site would further constrain the school which is already lacking sufficient sports facilities. The area surrounds the existing school and is open land.	Criterion 7 and 8 require appropriate contributions to both the school and community infrastructure.	No change.

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (26)	South of Ashford Road, Harrietsham	
Number of Support (1) / Object (17) / General Observations (2)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Density too high / lower density would be more appropriate / support a limit of 70 units / site should be enlarged to accommodate a further 50 units (Bidwells). This brownfield site should be developed before greenfield sites.	In the interests of making the most efficient use of land it is considered that the developable area of this site should be extended to the south. This would still enable the 25m buffer to the HS1.	Amend site boundary to the south. Development capacity increase from 70 to 117 dwellings.
It does not make any sense to extend the village on both sides of the A20 as it renders the A20 redundant as a bypass and will inevitably create stop/go traffic problems. This will bring: more noise, more pollution, with the associated health risks for the people of Harrietsham, more fuel consumption and the consequent impact on the fragile local environment. The A20 is heavily used by articulated lorries, which can access and leave Lenham storage only via Harrietsham. It is not a safe option to create another entry point onto the A20 directly behind the railway bridge.	Access from the A20 is regarded as most appropriate to reduce the impact on minor roads, Criteria 8 and 9 require improvements to the A20 corridor and pedestrian and cycle facilities.	No change.
This is agricultural land which has previously been ruined by the use of it for infrastructure developments i.e. M20 and the CTRL(HS1). The building of houses so near to the Harrietsham PINCH point of the HS1, M20 and the A20 would provide the occupants with an environmentally disastrous situation.	The site has been surveyed as Grade 4 land, which is not Best and Most Versatile. Policy favours the use of previously utilised land for mixed use development. Appropriate mitigation will be put in place to address the impact of the transport infrastructure, including the incorporation of an air quality criterion.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
No mention of village square or retail in accordance with the	The Council has taken account of	No change.

neighbourhood plan. Constraints and infrastructure references ignore the emerging neighbourhood plan. Agreement to the provision of small scale retail on the site (Bidwells).		emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination. The policy for this site refers to additional retail provision (criterion 2).	
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (27)	Mayfield Nursery, Ashford Road, Harrietsham		
Number of Support (0)/ Object (18) / General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased risk of flooding. Development may cause flooding issues elsewhere. This land is very wet due to surface water draining onto the site. This area is a water sump impacted by the railway line.		The site is not within flood zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Density should be lower. 35 dwellings would be more appropriate. This brownfield site should be developed before greenfield sites.		The proposed number of houses is considered appropriate having regard to the site's characteristics and the need to make the efficient use of land. The draft Local Plan does indeed identify brownfield sites; more than 3,000 homes are planned on previously used land in	No change.

		the Maidstone urban area.	
Site lies outside the core of the village with its facilities. Would provide an easterly expansion of the village through heavy infill within an area which currently has low density housing.		Policy seeks to distribute new housing allocations to the most sustainable existing settlements. Of necessity some greenfield sites at the edge of these settlements will be required.	No change.
Noise from rail freight traffic would make these units intolerable – A20 noise would add to this.		Criterion 5 specifically requires a noise survey to determine attenuation measures to take account of road and rail traffic.	No change.
Safe pedestrian or cycle access to the village would be extremely difficult. This would create another access point onto the A20. Parking and access problems would increase pressure on the area.		Criterion 8 requires improvements to pedestrian and cycle access.	No change.
The constraints and infrastructure requirements ignore the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.		The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (28)	Church Road, Harrietsham		
Number of Support (0) / Object (20)/ General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change

<p>Density is too high. 45 dwellings would be appropriate. Site should only be developed after brownfield sites.</p>	<p>There is a resolution to grant consent for 80 dwellings on this site. The draft Local Plan does indeed identify brownfield sites; more than 3,000 homes are planned on previously used land in the Maidstone urban area. The scale of future housing growth is such that some greenfield sites are needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Increased traffic. Impact on parking facilities. Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian). It does not make any sense to extend the village on both sides of the A20 as it renders the A20 redundant as a bypass and will inevitably create stop/go traffic problems. This will bring: more noise, more pollution, with the associated health risks for the people of Harrietsham, more fuel consumption and the consequent impact on the fragile local environment. Noise from the road and rail activities would be negative environmentally and socially.</p>	<p>Access from the A20 is regarded as most appropriate to reduce the impact on minor roads, Criteria 8 and 9 require improvements to the A20 corridor and pedestrian and cycle facilities.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>New housing would increase access problems to the A20 and add to the already dangerous accident prone zone The A20 is heavily used by articulated lorries, which can access and leave Lenham storage only via Harrietsham. It is not a safe option to create another entry point onto the A20 directly behind the railway bridge.</p>	<p>Access from the A20 is regarded as most appropriate to reduce the impact on minor roads, Criteria 8 and 9 require improvements to the A20 corridor and pedestrian and cycle facilities.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>This is existing agricultural land and provides some of the green element within the village envelope. Need to retain hedgerows. Loss of trees. Loss of green lung for the village.</p>	<p>Some loss of some agricultural land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible. The policy requires the retention of the northern boundary trees.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan. The constraints and infrastructure</p>	<p>The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The</p>	<p>No change.</p>

requirements ignore the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.		evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	
Impact on Conservation Area.		Criterion 2 requires consideration of the impact on the listed almshouses; further work to be considered on strategic heritage and conservation criteria.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection.
Increased risk of flooding.		The site is not within flood zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Lack of facilities.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (29)	Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham		
Number of Support (0) / Object (13) / General Observations (1)			

Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
<p>Impact on village character. Development would make Lenham as small town and mean loss of village feel. Inappropriate expansion of Lenham. Urban sprawl. Sits outside village envelope.</p>	<p>Lenham has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Lenham.</p>	
<p>Impact on countryside. Impact on views to Lenham Cross. Impact on other local landscape areas. Impact on AONB and setting – (AONB Unit) maintain objection to this allocation (the views from the scarp are one of the purposes of designation. Mitigation would need to include more than boundary treatments – increased greening within the site to ensure tree cover between development, non-reflective roofing, controlled height of dwellings, controlled lighting, care of materials and colours, developer contributions to maintenance of boundaries and PRow access to the Kent Downs (AONB Unit).</p>	<p>Existing Policy SP5 identifies the significance of countryside throughout the Borough and the need to mitigate the impacts of development on the appearance and character of the landscape.</p> <p>Site is seen in context of existing development to the east and west of the site. Add additional criterion to deal with landscape and visual impact and the need to maintain vistas of 'Lenham Cross'.</p> <p>The impact of lighting would be considered in detail as part of the planning application process</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.</p> <p>Amend existing criterion 1 to read:</p> <p>The hedgerow and line of trees along the northern and southern boundaries of the site will be retained and substantially enhanced by new planting in order to protect the setting of the Kent Downs AONB, and to provide a suitable buffer between new housing and the A20 Ashford Road and Old Ashford Road.</p> <p>Add new criteria to read :</p> <p>The development proposals shall be designed to maintain existing vistas and views of the Lenham Cross from Old Ashford Road through the site and along PRow KH433.</p> <p>Development proposals shall</p>

		<p>incorporate substantial areas of internal landscaping within the site to provide an appropriate landscape framework for the site to protect the setting of the Kent Downs AONB</p> <p>Development proposals will be of a high standard of design and sustainability reflecting the location of the site as part of the setting the Kent Downs AONB incorporating the use of vernacular materials and demonstrating compliance with the requirements of policies DM2, DM3 and DM4.</p> <p>The development proposals are designed to take into account the results of a landscape and visual impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the principles of current guidance that particularly addresses the impact of development on the character and setting of the Kent Downs AONB.</p>
Highway infrastructure is insufficient and unsafe. Impact on parking facilities. Highway impacts. Local roads cannot accommodate further traffic.	Any proposed development will be subject to consultation with the highway authority as appropriate.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Access should be via the A20.	For a site of this size, it is regarded as more appropriate for the access to be from Old Ashford Road.	No change.
Proposed number of dwellings too high. Too much development	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis	No change.

already planned for village.	of the housing required (SHMA) . The council's SHEDLAA studies identify the most appropriate locations for proposed housing in terms of availability and feasibility and policies seek to increase the use of previously developed land. Lenham has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Lenham.	
Increased risk of flooding.	The site is not within flood zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Lack of local services including, including schools and medical.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Lack of public open space.	Appropriate public open space is required to be provided as part of any proposed development.	No change.
Build on primary school site instead.	It is not regarded as appropriate to allocate the primary school site for housing.	No change.

Local views not being taken on board.		Extensive public consultation takes place as an intrinsic element of the local plan making process, and all representations are considered.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (30)	Glebe Gardens, Lenham		
Number of Support (1) / Object (9) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Amend policy in light of current application and gifting of the pond to the Parish Council.		Criterion 2 refers to the pond. No further specific reference is required.	No change.
Safeguard pond as accessible open space. Glebe Pond is the visible source of the river Len and as such of high landscape value for the Maidstone Borough. It is also important in respect of Lenham's history and identity as it is regarded as the village pond.		Glebe Pond is to be enhanced as part of any proposed development of the site.	New policy formulation for countryside and landscape protection.
Request for added criteria relating to controlled lighting, developer contributions to the maintenance of boundaries and PRoW in the KDAONB, improved ProW network to join Prow on the south with Prow to the north (AONB Unit).		The impact of lighting would be considered in detail as part of the planning application process. Criterion 9 seeks to secure improvements to adjacent PROW	No change
Insufficient infrastructure and local services.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Too many houses, detrimental to village character.		Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required (SHMA) .	No change.

Damage to countryside on the edge of the AONB.		Existing Policy SP5 identifies the significance of countryside throughout the Borough and the need to mitigate the impacts of development on the appearance and character of the landscape. This specific site is not on the edge of the AONB.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and policy on designated areas.
Local roads cannot accommodate further traffic / increased congestion.		A certain amount of extra traffic on Glebe Gardens will be inevitable but is not regarded as excessive. KCC Highways has not objected to the allocation of this site.	No change.
Objections to planning application sustained.		Noted.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (31)	Ham Lane, Lenham		
Number of Support (0)/ Object (10)/ General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
No greenbelt between Westwood Grange and the proposed development will create light pollution to the detriment of night bird-life and bats. Wildlife habitat impacts.		An ecological survey has been submitted with the current planning application for this site. In the SHLAA, KCC Ecology assessed that the development of this site would have minor ecological impacts which would be likely to be capable of mitigation.	No change.
Out of character with village. Impact on the setting of the AONB. Coalescence with Harrietsham. Damage to countryside. Loss of visual amenity. Harm to landscape. Loss of agricultural land.		Specific requirements are included in the policy for this site to protect the setting of the Kent Downs AONB.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and policy on designated areas.
Access will be dangerous; cycle improvements not practical to implement; Ham Lane serves Lenham Storage, which makes any access from a side road dangerous. The improvements to pedestrian		Improvements to pedestrian and cycle links and crossings to Lenham and on Ham Lane are required by the policy for	No change.

<p>and cycle links to Lenham village centre could only be achieved by narrowing the road to accommodate a pavement and cycle lane but it is doubted that Ham Lane is wide enough to allow such an alteration. Roads cannot accommodate further traffic. Increased congestion. Ham Lane used by HGVs. Pedestrian safety implications. Parking issues will worsen. Car parking should be met within the site during construction.</p>	<p>this site (Criteria 7 and 8). KCC Highways did not object to the allocation of this site.</p>	
<p>Insufficient infrastructure. Impact on school, GP places and shops.</p>	<p>Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p>
<p>This is a greenfield site. Building on greenfield sites does not meet the objective of sustainability. Contest that the number of houses are needed.</p>	<p>Existing Policy NPPF1 requires all proposed development to satisfy national criteria for sustainability. Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required and the implementation of national policy and it is inevitable that some greenfield sites will be required to provide the numbers required.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Development will be unaffordable for local people</p>	<p>Policy DM24 specifies affordable housing thresholds and criteria.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Request for added criteria relating to: heights, and materials of roofs; controlled lighting; increased GI throughout site; developer contributions to the maintenance of boundaries and PRoW in the KDAONB (AONB Unit).</p>	<p>Agreed. Additional criterion should be added to enhance landscaping within the site and to ensure the development proposals reflect the location of the site in the setting of the Kent Downs AONB.</p> <p>The impact of lighting would be considered in detail as part of the</p>	<p>Add additional criteria to read:</p> <p>The development proposals are designed to take into account the results of a landscape and visual impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the principles of current guidance that particularly addresses the impact of development on the character and setting of the</p>

		planning application process	<p>Kent Downs AONB</p> <p>Development proposals shall incorporate substantial areas of internal landscaping within the site to provide an appropriate landscape framework for the site to protect the setting of the Kent Downs AONB</p> <p>Development proposals will be of a high standard of design and sustainability reflecting the location of the site as part of the setting the Kent Downs AONB incorporating the use of vernacular materials and demonstrating compliance with the requirements of policies DM2, DM3 and DM4</p>
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (32)	Howland Road, Marden		
Number of Support (1) / Object (14) / General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Traffic problems in the south will increase. A contribution should be made to improvements on the A229 where traffic may add to congestion, particularly in the Maidstone urban area. Unsuitable road network, inadequate transport strategy. Increased rat-running on rural lanes. No space for footpath widening.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not adequate to require a contribution to major road improvements. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	No change.
Widen vehicular and pedestrian access.		Criterion 10 requires the widening of the footpath on Howland Road to improve	No change.

	accessibility and safety.	
<p>Increased risk of flooding. Policy needs to take account of flooding on adjacent sites. Issues with flooding.</p> <p>The EA has advised that this site is in flood zone 1 but that adjacent sites are at risk from surface water flooding. The site therefore requires suitable surface water drainage infrastructure and to take account of existing hydraulic structures even though the site is at low risk of fluvial flooding. (Environment Agency)</p>	<p>Flood mitigation measures have been addressed through the planning application recently granted for the site. Notwithstanding this, the criterion could be usefully clarified to respond to the EA's point.</p>	<p>Amend criterion 6 to read: Appropriate surface water and robust flood mitigation measures will be implemented where the site coincides with identified flood risk zones subject to a flood risk assessment incorporating sustainable drainage systems.</p>
<p>Inadequate infrastructure including – sewerage/draining/surface water drainage. Issues with surface water drainage.</p>	<p>See above comment.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Impact on agricultural land and impact on Low Weald, which is sensitive.</p>	<p>The site was classified in the 1994 ALC survey as having little or no agricultural value. Some loss of some agricultural land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Hedge along site boundary required. New woodland adjacent to pond is required for wildlife.</p>	<p>Criterion 2 requires the provision of hedgerow along the northern boundary of the site. Criterion 6 requires an ecological survey. This site now has planning permission.</p>	<p>No change .</p>
<p>Development will overwhelm village. A smaller development of no more than 10 dwellings would be acceptable. Marden is remote and lacks facilities.</p>	<p>Marden has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Marden. This specific site now has planning permission.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

No positive dialogue with the parish		Noted however a series of specific Local Plan/Parish Council meetings were held in Sept-Nov 2014.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (33)	Stanley Farm, Plain Road, Marden		
Number of Support (0) / Object (13)/ General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased congestion. Traffic problems to the south will increase. A contribution should be made to improvements on the A229 where traffic from these sites may add to congestion, particularly in the Maidstone urban area. Traffic monitoring is required. Road network is unsuitable and the transport strategy is inadequate. Increase in rat-running on rural lanes.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not adequate to require a contribution to major road improvements. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	No change.
Proposed requirements for access are not suitable and should be amended. Access through land to the south of Napoleon Drive should be suitable to serve the development. Access should be from Napoleon Drive and Plain Road.		Access is to be taken from Plain Road (Criterion 4) and improved pedestrian and cycle access required to Napoleon Drive. Access arrangements have now been confirmed through the recent planning application.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure. Issues with surface water drainage.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Increased risk of flooding. Flooding mitigation required. Include the criteria titled 'flooding and water quality' (Marden PC) with subsequent conditions and references to SUDS. Issues with flooding.		Site drainage matters have been addressed through the recent planning application.	No change.
Inappropriate extension to the village, especially when considered with H34. Will overwhelm village.		Marden has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for	No change.

		development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Marden. In this context, this site with the mitigation measures proposed is considered suitable for development.	
Marden is remote. Lack of facilities.		Marden has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Marden	No change.
Impact on agricultural land and the Low Weald which is sensitive.		Some loss of some agricultural land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum. The site is now subject to a resolution to grant planning permission.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (34)	The Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden		
Number of Support (0) / Object (11) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased congestion. A contribution should be made to improvements on the A229 where traffic from these sites may add to congestion, particularly in the Maidstone urban area. Traffic problems in the south will increase. Road network is unsuitable and the transport strategy is inadequate. Increase in rat-running on rural lanes.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not adequate to require a contribution to major road improvements. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate. Planning permission has been granted for 144 units.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure, issues with surface water drainage.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers	No change.

	to ensure adequate provision. The policy for this site includes a specific requirement for surface water and flood mitigation measures. The site now has outline consent.	
Loss of agricultural/ greenfield land. Impact on Low Weald which is sensitive.	Some loss of some agricultural land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible. The site now has planning permission	No change.
Increased risk of flooding. Issues with flooding.	Criterion 5 requires that appropriate surface water and robust flood mitigation measures will be required for any proposed development.	No change.
Marden is remote. Lack of facilities.	Marden has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Marden.	No change.
Development will overwhelm village.	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required and the existing character of the village will be taken into account at the detailed planning application stage.	No change.
Amend to show addition of land to the south to enable the development of 200 dwellings (Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd).	Additional land submitted as part of most recent 'call for sites'.	No change.

Mix and integration of affordable homes required.		Policy DM24 specifies affordable housing thresholds and criteria.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (35)	Marden Cricket and Hockey Club, Stanley Road, Marden		
Number of Support (1) / Object (14) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased congestion / traffic. A contribution should be made to improvements on the A229 where traffic from these sites may add to congestion, particularly in the Maidstone urban area. Traffic problems in the south will increase. Road network is unsuitable and the transport strategy is inadequate.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not adequate to require a contribution to major road improvements. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	No change.
Marden is remote. Lack of facilities. Will facilitate improved sports facilities for the village and other local communities. Object to the allocation of sports fields for development. Re-provision of sports facilities north of the railway line not adequate.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Access should be through South Road.		Access from either Albion Road or Stanley Road is regarded as most appropriate, in discussions with the highway authority.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure, issues with surface water drainage.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Impact on agricultural land. Impact on Low Weald which is sensitive. Loss of green space at the heart of the village.		Some loss of some agricultural land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible.	No change.

Increased risk of flooding. Include flooding and water quality criteria (Marden PC) with subsequent conditions and references to sustainable drainage systems. Issues with flooding.		This issue has been addressed through the recent planning application with drainage improvements secured by condition.	No change.
The proposal will turn Marden into a town. Overly large extension of village which will be overwhelmed.		Marden has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Marden.	No change.
Mix and integration of affordable housing required.		Policy DM24 specifies affordable housing thresholds and criteria.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (36)	Hen and Duckhurst Farm, Marden Road, Staplehurst		
Number of Support (1) / Object (12) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased congestion. These are large developments which should either contribute to areas of congestion on the A229 in the Maidstone urban area or to enhancing the bus service between Maidstone and Staplehurst. Planning permission should only be granted if it includes a new rail crossing. Increased rat-running on rural lanes.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not adequate to require a contribution to major road improvements. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate. Detailed Visim modelling is being undertaken for the Staplehurst crossroads.	No change.
Yield should be reduced to take account of ecological issues, trees and hedgerows, SUDS, play areas, roads (Staplehurst PC).		Agreed. Site capacity to be amended from 370 to 250 dwellings.	Amend site capacity to 250 dwellings.
Protect mature oak tree.		Tree Preservation Order will be made on any trees which merit specific protection.	No change.

<p>No assessment of infrastructure requirements. Inadequate infrastructure.</p>	<p>Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.</p>
<p>Lack of local services and facilities. Significant new facilities should be provided. Housing should not be permitted without commitment to provide a site for and fund and new village hall complex.</p>	<p>Staplehurst has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Staplehurst. Criteria 11 of the policy provides for contributions for community infrastructure where it is proven necessary.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>New growth should be an asset - Conservation Area for the future. Staplehurst should not be a Rural Service Centre as it would destroy village identity. Will overwhelm character of village. Care required with design.</p>	<p>Policies for Rural Service Centres seek to enhance village identity and facilities and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements.</p>	<p>New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and policy on designated areas.</p>
<p>Site can be delivered at a higher density (30-50) within 5 years. Redraw net developable area to reflect need for open space and drainage. Yield should be reduced to 270. 905 is unsustainable. Numbers should be limited to 400, affordable housing too high.</p>	<p>Staplehurst has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Staplehurst.</p> <p>Policy for this site seeks to balance housing need with the constraints onsite. Open space is required as part of any proposed development (Criterion 10). It is agreed that the site capacity of this site</p>	<p>Amend site capacity to 250 dwellings.</p>

		be amended to 250 dwellings. Affordable housing requirements are set out in Policy DM24. This policy is to be further reviewed.	
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (37)	Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst		
Number of Support (1) / Object (14) / General Observations (2)			
Summary of issues	Officer Response		Proposed change
Increased traffic / congestion. These are large developments which should either contribute to areas of congestion on the A229 in the Maidstone urban area or to enhancing the bus service between Maidstone and Staplehurst. Planning permission should only be granted if it includes a new rail crossing. Increased rat-running on rural lanes. Impact on Staplehurst crossroads. Need northern road network as set out in Staplehurst Neighbourhood Plan.	Some increase in traffic is inevitable. Criterion 12 seeks to address/mitigate for the impacts on the A229/Headcorn Road/Marden Road junction. Visim traffic modelling of this junction is being undertaken.		No change.
No assessment of infrastructure requirements. Inadequate infrastructure.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.		New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Lack of local services and facilities. Significant new facilities should be provided. Housing should not be permitted without commitment to provide a site for and fund a new village hall complex. Existing amenities and infrastructure cannot cope.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.		No change.
New growth should be an asset - Conservation Area for the future. Will overwhelm character of village. Care required with design.	Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning		New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and policy on designated areas.

	applications.	
Yield should be reduced to take account of ecological issues, trees and hedgerows, SUDS, play areas, roads (Staplehurst Parish Council). Proposed number of dwellings too high. Numbers should be limited to 400, affordable housing too high. Yield is too high.	Policy for this site seeks to balance housing need with the constraints onsite. Open space is required as part of any proposed development (Criterion 10). Development will be subject to the results and recommendations of an ecological survey (Criterion 7). Site capacity is considered appropriate having regard to the characteristics of the site and its location. Affordable housing requirements are set out in Policy DM24. This policy is to be further reviewed.	No change.
905 are unsustainable.	Staplehurst has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Staplehurst.	No change.
Loss of greenfield land. Pond should be protected. Hedgerows should be protected.	Some loss of some greenfield land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible. Criterion 1 requires the retention and enhancement of hedges and trees on the site. The strategy for the ponds on site will be addressed through the ecological survey (criterion 7) and site drainage measures (criterion 8).	No change.

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (38)	Old School Nursery, Station Road, Headcorn	
Number of Support (10) / Object (46) / General Observations (2)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Inadequate infrastructure, including sewerage, drainage, water supply, utilities. Growth should follow infrastructure. Plan in a comprehensive way.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities, including school, doctors surgery, dental surgery and young people/children's facilities.	This site has planning permission. The approved development is for 9 units which is below the threshold for a s106.	No change.
Increased traffic / congestion. Impact on parking facilities. Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian). Impact on train services. Development will require off road provision for parking.	The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not sufficient to justify a contribution to road improvements. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as acceptable in the context of the site's location within the village. It is also adjacent to the railway station.	No change.
Proposed number of dwellings too high. Object to large scale of development. No consideration given to impact. Overdevelopment. Lack of demand for housing. Support for small development. Small piece of land not detrimental to surrounding area. Recognise need for housing in moderation. Allow 10, rather than 5 – smaller houses to accommodate commuters. Yield should be increased from 5-10 (Wealden Homes).	Site has consent for 9 dwellings.	No change.
Increased risk of flooding.	These matters have been addressed through the planning application.	No change.
Impact on village character, urbanising effect.	The site is located within the village adjacent to the railway station and existing development.	No change.

Impact on green space and environment. Loss of agricultural / greenfield land. Small infill on brownfield land.		The site is located within the village adjacent to the railway station and existing development. It is previously developed, not greenfield.	
Conflict with Neighbourhood Plan. Density should be increased.		The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Alternative derelict farm site would be a better option.		This proposed alternative site was assessed and considered unsuitable for housing development in the previous Call for Sites.	No change.
Impact on local residents. Insufficient amenities. Building needs to be in harmony with existing housing.		Impacts on local residents were considered as part of the planning application process.	No change.
Support providing there is agreement from the nursery.		Noted.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (39)	Ulcombe Road and Mill Bank, Headcorn		
Number of Support (0) / Object (110) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Inadequate infrastructure including sewerage, drainage, surface water drainage, water supply, utilities. Growth should follow infrastructure. Plan comprehensively.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities, including school, medical facilities, dental surgery, communication, transport, young		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community	No change.

people / children's facilities, police presence. Lack of detail.	infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	
Increased traffic / congestion. Local road infrastructure unsuited. Impact on parking facilities. Highway safety concerns (including pedestrian). Impact on train services – station is too small. Footpaths need improved. Pressure on rural lands / local roads. Not enough public transport. Concern about road safety in Grigg Lane. Concern about condition of Grigg Lane.	Criteria 9 & 10 seek appropriate highway improvements.	No change.
Increased risk of flooding. Edge of flood plain. In a flood zone. On hillside and sewerage outflow will increase problems in Kings Road area and Moat Road. Increased flooding from over development.	Criterion 6 requires that appropriate surface water and robust flood mitigation measures will be required for any proposed development.	No change.
Site extends too far north. Impact on village character (30% increase). Urbanising effect. Would become a town.	Headcorn has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough's most sustainable settlements such as Headcorn. Potential sites, including this site, have been assessed for their suitability fully through the SHLAA. The policy for this site requires additional landscaping to help mitigate the visual impact of the development from the countryside to the north.	No change.
Proposed number of dwellings too high. Too dense. Cumulative impact not assessed. Object to large scale development. No consideration given to impact. Overdevelopment. Smaller sites preferred. No need. Development out of scale. 425 are too many homes.	Additional housing growth is proposed as a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required and the implementation of national policy which seeks to increase housing densities to reduce land take required.	No change.
Loss of agricultural land/greenfield land/countryside. Use brownfield.	The site was classified as Grade 3b in the	New policy formulation to strengthen

Outside village envelope. Impact on green/open space. Major extension into SLA.	1994 ALC survey which is not Best and Most Versatile land. The proposed site capacity is considered appropriate having regard to the site's characteristics and the need to make efficient use of land.	countryside protection.
Contrary to emerging neighbourhood plan.	The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Lack of / detrimental to amenities of existing residents. Inadequate screening from existing development. Impact on quality of life.	Appropriate measures to address residential amenity and landscaping will be secured through detailed design at planning application stage.	No change.
Access to Millbank unsuitable.	Millbank is a classified A road. KCC Highways have not objected to the allocation of this site.	No change.
Detrimental to local wildlife and trees.	Criterion 5 of the site specific policy requires a phase 1 ecological survey.	No change.
Environmental impact. Concern about standards of construction.	Detailed policies enable the consideration of the environmental impact of proposed development. Building control regulations determine standard of construction.	No change.
Alternative derelict farm site would be a better option.	This proposed alternative site was assessed and considered unsuitable for housing development in the previous Call for Sites.	No change.

Policy Number	Site Name	
H1 (40)	Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn	
Number of Support (2) / Object (79) / General Observations (0)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
There is inadequate infrastructure – including sewerage, drainage, surface water disposal, water supply, utilities. It is important that growth follows infrastructure improvements.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision..	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
There will be increased traffic and congestion, an impact on parking facilities, increased highway safety concerns, an impact on train services and an impact on rural lanes. Footpaths need improved and the station is too small. Concern about vehicle access.	Some increase in traffic is inevitable. KCC Highways has not objected to the allocation of this site. Criterion 9 will provide for an improved pedestrian environment.	No change.
There is a lack of/pressure on local services and facilities – including schools, doctor surgery, dental surgery, young people/children’s facilities, transport, communications and police presence.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
The site is on the edge of a flood plain, there will be increased flooding and potential for water pollution.	Planning permission granted on part of the site. The identified developable part site is not within flood zones 2 or 3.	No change.
The proposed number of dwellings is too high with no consideration of the impact on Headcorn. Cumulative impacts are not assessed and the proposed development is too large. Overdevelopment. Development should be more evenly distributed around Kent.	Headcorn has been identified as a Rural Service Centre capable of further growth. To address the growing need for housing some land must be allocated for development at the edge of the borough’s most sustainable settlements such as Headcorn. Potential sites, including this site, have been assessed for their suitability fully through the SHLAA.	No change.
Detrimental impact on village/rural character, urbanising effect.	Development of 25 dwellings and a	No change.

Inappropriate extension to village. Impact on existing residents / inadequate screening from existing development. Major extension into SLA.	doctors' surgery has recently taken place on Grigg Lane to the south east of this site.	
Loss of countryside / agricultural / greenfield land. Use brownfield land. Loss of green space	Some loss of open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Inconsistent with emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Detrimental to local wildlife.	The policy requires a phase 1 ecological survey. Mitigation measures have been secured as part of the previous phases of development.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Environmental impact, concerns over standards of construction.	Detailed policies enable the consideration of the environmental impact of proposed development. Building control regulations determine standard of construction.	No change.
Yield could be lower due to ecological and surface water constraints.	It is proposed that the yield be amended to take account of the extant permissions.	Amend the site capacity to 80 dwellings.
Site should be extended to include other proposal sites HO30, HO131,	These alternative sites have been considered as part of the second call for	No change.

HO132, HO134.		sites.	
Alternative derelict farm site would be a better option for development		This proposed alternative site was assessed and considered unsuitable for housing development in the previous Call for Sites.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (41)	South of Grigg Lane, Headcorn		
Number of Support (0) / Object (92)/ General Observations(2)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
There is a lack of / pressure on local services and facilities – including schools, doctor surgery, dental surgery, young people/children’s facilities, transport, and police presence.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
There is inadequate infrastructure – including sewerage, drainage, surface water disposal, water supply, utilities. It is important that growth follows infrastructure improvements.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
There will be increased traffic and congestion, an impact on parking facilities, increased highway safety concerns (including pedestrian) , an impact on train services and an impact on rural lanes. Footpaths need improved and the station is too small. Inadequate road widths.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive and contributions for pedestrian improvements will be required. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	No change.
The site is on the edge of a flood plain, there will be increased risk of flooding and potential for water pollution. The site is in a flood zone, a problem occurred recently.		Criterion 6 requires that appropriate surface water and robust flood mitigation measures will be implemented for any proposed development.	No change.
The proposed number of dwellings (scale of development) is too high		Additional housing growth is proposed as	No change.

<p>with no consideration given to impact. Cumulative impacts are not assessed and the proposed development is too large. Overdevelopment. Development should be more evenly distributed around Kent.</p>	<p>a result of a rigorous process of analysis of the housing required (SHMA) and the implementation of national policy. The density of development on this site is considered appropriate having regard to the site's characteristics and context.</p>	
<p>Detrimental impact on village/rural character, urbanising effect.</p>	<p>There has been recent development on the north side of Grigg Lane opposite the site and the substantial development of the glasshouses to the north east. In this context, development of this site is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Reservations about limited capacity which is based on out of date flood mapping no longer used by EA. Additional land should be included which will increase the net developable area and dwelling numbers as per the site submission to the plan.</p>	<p>The site plan does need to be amended to more clearly define the developable area of the site. The site's agent has now provided further flooding information, agreed by the Environment Agency, which supports development of a larger part of the site.</p>	<p>Amend site plan to show the revised extent of the developable area of the site.</p>
<p>Loss of countryside/agricultural/greenfield land. Use brownfield land. Loss of green space. Not unused land. Clarity on plan needed to ensure the grey area remains undeveloped.</p>	<p>The site is classified as Grade 3b land which is not Best and Most Versatile. Some loss of open and agricultural land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum. The site plan does need to be amended to more clearly define the developable area of the site. The site's agent has now provided further flooding information, agreed by the Environment Agency, which supports development of a larger part of the site.</p>	<p>Amend site plan to show the revised extent of the developable area of the site.</p>

Inconsistent with emerging Neighbourhood Plan.		The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Inappropriate extension to village. Impact on existing residents / loss of amenities including greenspace / inadequate screening from existing development. Major extension into SLA.		There has been recent development on the north side of Grigg Lane opposite the site and the substantial development of the glasshouses to the north east. In this context, development of this site is considered appropriate.	No change.
Environmental impact, detrimental to local wildlife, concern about standards of construction.		Criterion 5 requires an ecological survey of the site. Construction standards are primarily dealt with by Building Control regulations.	No change.
20 – 30 dwellings could be supported.		The proposed capacity of this site is considered appropriate having regard to the need to make efficient use of land.	No change.
Alternative derelict farm site would be a better option for development.		This proposed alternative site was assessed and considered unsuitable for housing development in the previous Call for Sites.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (42)	Knaves Acres, Headcorn		
Number of Support (5) / Object (37) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change

There is inadequate infrastructure – including sewerage, drainage, water supply, utilities. It is important that growth follows infrastructure improvements and planning is done in a comprehensive way.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Pressure on local services and facilities – including schools, medical facilities, young people/children’s facilities, and police presence.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
There will be increased traffic and congestion, an impact on parking facilities, increased highway safety concerns (including pedestrian) and an impact on train services. Inadequate road widths.	The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive and contributions for pedestrian improvements will be required. KCC Highways has not objected to the allocation of this site.	No change.
Inappropriate access.	Access can be gained from adjacent permitted site.	No change.
The proposed number of dwellings (scale of development) is too high with no consideration given to impact. Cumulative impacts are not assessed. Overdevelopment. Recognise need for housing in moderation, support but concerned the site would be expanded, small infill site which accords with Local Plan.	This is a modest development of 5 dwellings.	No change.
Increased risk of flooding.	This site does not fall within the flood plain.	No change.
Detrimental impact on village character, urbanising effect.	This site is adjacent to a site which has permission for residential development.	No change.
Impact on existing residents / loss of amenities including greenspace	Impacts on existing residents are considered as part of the development management process. Criterion 4 requires the provision of publicly accessible open space.	No change.

Inconsistency with emerging Neighbourhood Plan.		The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Loss of agricultural greenfield land. Use brownfield land.		The site is classified as Grade 3b which is not within the Best and Most Versatile category.	No change.
Environmental impact, detrimental to local wildlife, concern about standards of construction.		A criterion in the policy requires an ecological survey of the site. Construction standards are primarily dealt with by Building Control regulations.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Alternative derelict farm site would be a better option for development		This proposed alternative site was assessed and considered unsuitable for housing development in the previous Call for Sites.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (43)	Linden Farm, Stockett Lane, Coxheath		
Number of Support (4) / Object (170) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Inadequate transport strategy, unsuitable road network, highway impacts, increased traffic and congestion, highway capacity concerns, highway safety concerns, footpaths need improved, pressure on local roads, increased rat-running, lack of footpaths, support providing		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive and contributions for highway and pedestrian improvements will be required.(Criteria 7 and 8). Further	Add a criterion to the policy to read Appropriate contributions towards improvements at the junction of the B2163 Heath Road with the A229

road improvements are made.	criteria will require an appropriate contribution towards improvements at the junction of B2163 and A229 Linton crossroads junction. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate subject to the proposed mitigation.	Linton Road/Linton Hill at Linton Crossroads.
Concerns about vehicle access to the site.	Access will be taken from Stockett Lane only which is considered suitable.	No change.
Pressure on local services and facilities, including school, doctor surgery, chemist, dental surgery. No recreation facilities or community facilities proposed.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure, including sewerage, drainage, water supply, utilities. Growth should follow infrastructure.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Loss of agricultural land/greenfield/countryside. Use brownfield land at Olders Field and Clockhouse Farm in preference. Support in preference to Clockhouse Farm and Heathfield Sites.	The land is classified as Grade 3b which is not within the Best and Most Versatile category. Some loss of agricultural and open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Detrimental impact on village character/identity. Coalescence.	Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications. In respect of this site specifically, substantial separation from the adjacent settlement is maintained.	New policy formulation to strengthen village character protection.
Proposed number of dwellings too high, density too high, 40 dwellings appropriate (Coxheath PC), Coxheath should not have the	The capacity of this site should be reduced to reflect the provision of	Amend site capacity to 40 dwellings. Amend site plan to show reduced

same proposed level of growth as a Rural Service Centre.		community facilities within the site.	developable area for housing.
Contrary to neighbourhood plan, would prefer number of homes in the Neighbourhood Plan		The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Pollution – air and noise		Air and noise pollution issues are not regarded as particularly significant in this location.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Detrimental to local farmland wildlife		Development will be subject to the results and recommendations of an ecological survey (criterion 4) .	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Detrimental to the amenities of existing residents, disruption during construction, impact on visual amenity of existing homes.		Appropriate detailed design will address amenity issues. Construction disruption is considered under environmental health legislation.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (44)	Heathfield, Heath Road, Coxheath		
Number of Support (0) / Object (266)/ General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Inadequate transport strategy, unsuitable road network, highway impacts, increased traffic and congestion, impact on parking facilities, insufficient parking, highway safety concerns (including pedestrian), pressure on local roads, increased rat-running, lack of footpaths,		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive and contributions for highway improvements will be required.(Criterion	No change

impact on existing footpath.	9). Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	
Pressure on / inadequate infrastructure, including sewerage, drainage, surface water disposal, water supply, utilities. Growth should follow infrastructure. Waste water management is already problematic.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Western hedgerow does not exist, detrimental to local farmland wildlife.	Amendment of Criterion 1 needed to reflect existing tree screen and the need for enhanced landscaping.	Amend criterion 1 to read The hedgerow <i>tree screen/windbreak</i> along the western boundary of the site will be retained <i>and reinforced with additional landscaping</i> in order to provide a suitable buffer between new housing and existing housing on Aspian Drive, and to protect the amenity and privacy of residents living in Aspian Drive.
Detrimental to the amenities of existing residents (including Aspian Drive), disruption during construction. No privacy for existing residents. Impact on human rights.	Appropriate detailed design will address amenity issues. Construction disruption is considered under environmental health legislation.	No change.
Concerns about vehicle access to the site, exit onto Heath Road will be dangerous, another access will be required.	KCC Highways has not objected to the allocation of this site.	No change.
Pressure on / lack of local services and facilities, including school, doctor surgery, chemist, dental surgery. The impact on services means this is an unsustainable site. Improve facilities before housing is developed.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Loss of agricultural land / greenfield / countryside. Use brownfield land at Olders Field and Clockhouse Farm in preference. Loss of accessible countryside. Contradicts paragraph 5.57 which seeks to	80.5% of the site is classified as grade 3b which is not in the Best and Most Versatile category, the remaining 19.5% in small pockets is grade 2. Some loss of	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.

safeguard and support farming.	agricultural and open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum.	
Proposed number of dwellings too high, density too high (Coxheath PC), Coxheath should not have the same proposed level of growth as a Rural Service Centre. Affordable housing provision too high – potential increase in crime, ASB.	Site capacity is considered to be appropriate having regard to the site and locations characteristics and the need to make efficient use of land. Coxheath has a range of facilities and services which make it one of the more sustainable settlements in the borough suitable for some growth. Affordable housing is covered in Policy DM24 which is being further considered.	No change.
Detrimental impact on village character / identity. Development would be intrusive, would become part of urban sprawl. It is vital that urban sprawl does not impinge on local villages or merge villages. Would cause coalescence (Coxheath PC). Coalescence with Loose. Ribbon development.	Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications. In this case, sufficient space would be maintained to avoid coalescence with Loose.	New policy formulation to strengthen village character protection.
Pollution – light, air and noise.	Pollution issues are not regarded as sufficiently significant for policy criteria.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Contrary to neighbourhood plan (Coxheath PC).	The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	No change.
Impact on countryside (Coxheath PC) and rural character, impact on	Existing Policy SP5 identifies the	New policy formulation to strengthen

greensand ridge, could become a country park, loss of landscape views, detrimental impact on rights of way.		significance of countryside throughout the Borough and the need to mitigate the impacts of development on the appearance and character of the landscape. Development proposals will address visual impact and impacts on the character of the surrounding area. Criteria 4 requires impact on the PROW to be taken into account.	countryside and rural character protection.
Concern about building design and standards, loss of property value.		Detailed policies require the consideration of building design and building control regulations deal with building standards.	No change.
Increased risk for flooding from surface water runoff.		The site is not within flood zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (45)	Forstal Lane, Coxheath		
Number of Support (3) / Object (273) / General Observations (0)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Inadequate transport strategy, unsuitable road network, highway impact, increased traffic and congestion, inadequate parking facilities, highway safety concerns (including pedestrian, and horse riders),		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive and contributions for highway	Additional criterion to read Appropriate contributions towards

pressure on rural lanes /local roads, increased rat-running, lack of footpaths, Forstal Lane dangerous, impact on footpath. Support providing road improvements are made.	and pedestrian improvements will be required (Criteria 8, 9 and 10). Further criteria will require an appropriate contribution towards improvements at the junction of B2163 and A229 Linton crossroads junction. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	improvements at the junction of the B2163 Heath Road with the A229 Linton Road/Linton Hill at Linton Crossroads.
Concerns about vehicle access to the site. Pedestrian and vehicle access is dangerous. Inappropriate access (Coxheath PC).	Vehicle access will be from Forstal Lane only and Criterion 10 requires pedestrian improvements.	No change.
Western hedgerow does not exist, detrimental to local farmland wildlife, impact on greensand ridge.	Hedgerow exists. Ecological impacts are addressed through criterion 5.	No change.
Inadequate infrastructure, including sewerage, drainage, water supply, utilities. Growth should follow infrastructure.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Loss of agricultural land / greenfield / greenbelt /countryside. Use brownfield land at Olders Field and Clockhouse Farm in preference. Support in preference to Clockhouse Farm and Heathfield Sites. Loss of publically accessible countryside. Support in preference to Heathfield site and Clockhouse Farm. Contradicts paragraph 5.57 which seeks to safeguard and support farming.	The site comprises a mixture of grade 3a 63%, grade 3b 22% and grade 2 15% land. Some loss of agricultural and open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum. This has to be weighed against the sustainable location of this site adjacent to an existing settlement.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Pressure on local services and facilities, including school, doctor surgery, chemist, dental surgery. No recreation facilities or community facilities proposed.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Detrimental impact on village character / identity. Development would be intrusive, impact on character of Loose village, the area	Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed	New policy formulation to strengthen villager character protection.

would become a suburb of Maidstone, loss of character of Forstal Lane.	policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications. Development of this site will still enable sufficient separation to be maintained to avoid coalescence with neighbouring settlements.	
Impact on countryside (Coxheath PC) – rural development, loss of separation between Coxheath and Loose, field is the boundary between Coxheath and Loose, contravention of anti-coalescence policy. Would cause coalescence (Coxheath PC). Landscape impact. Vital urban sprawl does not impinge on villages or merge villages. Impact on public rights of way.	Development of this site will still enable sufficient separation to be maintained to avoid coalescence with neighbouring settlements. Criterion 8 addresses the issue of the PROW.	No change.
Proposed number of dwellings too high, density should be lower, Coxheath should not have the same proposed level of growth as a Rural Service Centre, affordable housing provision too high.	Site capacity is considered to be appropriate having regard to the site and locations characteristics and the need to make efficient use of land. Coxheath has a range of facilities and services which make it one of the more sustainable settlements in the borough suitable for some growth. Affordable housing is covered in Policy DM24 which is being further considered.	No change.
Detrimental to the amenities of existing residents, disruption during construction, impact on adjacent properties.	Detailed design proposals will address any amenity concerns. Construction impact is addressed under environmental health legislation.	No change.
Pollution – air, light and noise	Pollution issues are not regarded as sufficiently significant for policy criteria.	New policy formulation to strengthen air quality measures.
Contrary to neighbourhood plan (Coxheath PC).	The Council has taken account of emerging neighbourhood plans. The	No change.

	evidence base and the need for a Borough-wide perspective means in some cases sites, capacities or policies may not match those in neighbourhood plans and they do not align in all respects. Ultimately differences will be tested at examination.	
Contrary to rural lanes protection policy.	The lane is semi-rural in nature. Criteria in policy will assist in ensuring development is suitable for edge of village location.	No change
Loss of house values	Loss of house value is not a material planning consideration.	No change.
Unsustainable site. Concern about building and design standards.	Site is immediately adjacent to Coxheath with its attendant facilities and services. Detailed policies require the consideration of building design and building control regulations deal with building standards.	No change.
Increased risk of flooding.	The site is not within flood zones 2 or 3. Notwithstanding this, as the site is greater than 1ha in size, a planning application would be accompanied by a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency would be consulted on this FRA and will advise on the suitability and adequacy of any mitigation measures proposed.	No change.
Site description wrong.	Not agreed. Site is considered to be grazing land.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name	

H1 (46)	Vicarage Road, Yalding	
Number of Support (0) / Object (172) / General Observations (2)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic and congestion – highway capacity concerns – impact on parking facilities – highway safety concerns (including pedestrian) – Unsuitable road network – rat-running – 1.2 miles from station with infrequent services and no disabled access - inadequate transport policy – public transport constrained – Vicarage Road is narrow and congested – pedestrian crossing would be required.	The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive and contributions for highway and pedestrian improvements will be required.(Criteria 7 and 8). Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	No change.
Detrimental impact on listed buildings and Conservation Area, impact on village character and appearance (including nature and structure). Would change the character of the site and would extend built form along Vicarage Road (Yalding PC)	Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications. Criterion 1 of the site policy considers impact on the conservation area.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and policy on designated areas.
Detrimental to wildlife, habitats and endangered species. Loss of hedgerows.	Further work being undertaken on habitats and wildlife issues which will provide guidance for designated areas and to prospective developers to maintain biodiversity. Criterion 3 requires a phase 1 ecological survey.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Pressure on/lack of village services and facilities, including school (oversubscribed), doctor surgery, shops and post office.	Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought.	No change.
Insufficient amenities to support new households. Harm to quality of	Policies seek to enhance amenities and facilities, and ensure that quality of life is	No change.

life.	maintained and where possible enhanced. Yalding has been identified as a settlement suitable for additional housing based on an assessment of its facilities and services.	
Loss of agricultural land / greenfield land / countryside/ allotments. Fields are pretty and add value to living in a village.	The site is classified as grade 2 land. Some loss of agricultural and open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum. This has to be weighed against the sustainable location of this site adjacent to an existing settlement. Criterion 1 requires structural landscaping to mitigate the impact on rural character.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection
Inadequate infrastructure.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Increased risk of flooding. Flood defence infrastructure for village is yet to evolve	Criterion 4 requires that appropriate surface water and robust flood mitigation measures will be implemented for any proposed development. Environment Agency has not objected to development of this site.	No change.
Concerns about access to the site.	Access will be taken from Vicarage Lane only at an appropriate width. KCC Highways did not object to the allocation of this site.	No change.
Unsustainable development (KCC). Yalding has a small convenience store, post officer, pub and restaurant. Having services locally does not mean people will use them and having an outside village development will simply mean people will shop on their way home from work (KCC). Site is outside the settlement boundary and people	Existing Policy NPPF1 requires that all proposed development is sustainable. Strengthening settlements with additional development on the edges adjacent to existing housing provides an	No change.

will contribute little to the local community or economy (KCC). Yalding has poor transport links. Outside existing village boundary, is therefore contrary to the Plan and has been rejected previously (Yalding PC).		opportunity for increased use of village facilities and services. Based on a assessment of its services and facilities, Yalding has been identified as one of the more sustainable settlements in the borough, capable of accommodating some growth.	
Site rejected at appeal for 5 dwellings so 65 would have a greater impact. Proposed number of dwellings too high.		Historic application (1966) for 3 units refused on road frontage. The current and projected need for new homes means that additional land is now required.	No change.
Noise pollution		Noise pollution is not regarded as being significant at this location.	No change.
Lack of communication with community, impact on equality.		Consultation has taken place at all stages of the plan making process.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (47)	Hubbards Land and HasteHill Road, Boughton Monchelsea.		
Number of Support (3) / Object (20) / General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic and congestion, poor parking facilities, impact on parking facilities, lack of parking on Hubbards Lane unsuitable road network, inadequate transport strategy, rat-running on rural lanes.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate. A new criterion is needed to ensure contribution from this site to improvements to the Linton crossroads	New criterion be added to read Appropriate contributions towards improvements at the junction of the B2163 Heath Road with the A229 Linton Road/Linton Hill at Linton Crossroads.
Inadequate infrastructure. Infrastructure required including school		Extensive consultation has taken place	New policy formulation to strengthen

and health facilities. Lack of local services and facilities.		with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision.	infrastructure requirements.
Site is in Loose Parish, density should reflect this (Loose PC). Boughton Monchelsea will be surrounded by development.		Noted. Amend site policy to confirm that the site falls within Loose parish. Nonetheless, the site is physically much more closely related to Boughton Monchelsea village	Amend site policy to confirm that the site falls within Loose parish.
Loss of agricultural/ greenfield land. Detrimental to local wildlife and habitats. Loss of landscape.		Some loss of open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible. Further work being undertaken on habitats and wildlife issues which will provide guidance for designated areas and to prospective developers to maintain biodiversity. In respect of this site specifically, criterion 3 requires an ecological survey.	New policy formulation to strengthen biodiversity and habitats protection.
Impact on village identity. Urban sprawl. Ribbon development.		Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications.	New policy formulation to strengthen village character protection.
Impact on amenity/privacy of existing residents.		Detailed design at planning application stage will address amenity issues.	No change.
Pollution.		Noise pollution is not regarded as being significant at this location.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (48)	Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea		

Number of Support (0) / Object (50)/ General Observations (1)		
Summary of issues	Officer Response	Proposed change
Increased traffic and congestion, poor parking facilities, impact on parking facilities, highway safety concerns (including pedestrian), pressure on local roads, unsuitable road network, inadequate transport strategy, rat-running on rural lanes poor bus service, poor connections. Lack of street lighting.	It has been confirmed that the access to the site is not within the control of the promoter of the site. On this basis it is no longer deliverable.	Delete as an allocation in the Plan.
Additional infrastructure required. Lack of local services and facilities, including school, medical facilities, shops		
Concerns about vehicle access to the site. Cobnutt Platt cannot be retained if access taken from church street. Poor pedestrian access. Access issues from Church Road.		
Inadequate infrastructure, including sewerage (Loose PC).		
Detrimental to wildlife and loss of habitat.		
Impact on amenity of existing residents, lack of community infrastructure, lack of privacy for existing residents. Loss of house values.		
Pollution and noise, including during construction.		
Loss of agricultural / greenfield land. Loss of landscape, loss of rural outlook. Use brownfield sites to regenerate the town of Maidstone.		
Increased risk of flooding (Loose PC).		
Loss of village identity.		
Change site name from Heath Road to Church Street. Site contains land no submitted by the landowner resulting in a smaller parcel that is 100% greenfield. Development previously refused due to harm to		

character of the area.			
EIA required.			
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (49)	East of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street		
Number of Support (2) / Object (3) / General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Lack of local services and facilities including school, health service and public transport.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought as required by criterion 7.	No change.
Increased traffic/congestion, highway infrastructure insufficient.		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate.	No change.
Detrimental impact on listed building and setting / historic centre / rural character.		Policies seek to enhance village identity and facilities, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications. Criterion 1 seeks to protect existing heritage assets.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection and policy on designated areas.
Inadequate infrastructure, including drainage.		Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision..	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Loss of open fields.		Some loss of open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is	No change.

		kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible.	
	Detrimental to local community.	Not agreed.	No change.
	Support for inclusion as a housing allocation.	Noted.	No change.
	Support providing trees are retained.	Noted.	No change.
	Additional criteria proposed relating to heights, and materials of roofs, controlled lighting increased GI throughout site and developer contributions for the maintenance of boundaries and PRoW in the KDAONB (AONB Unit).	Detailed policies determine the issues to be considered when a planning application is made, including scale and materials.	No change.
Policy Number	Site Name		
H1 (50)	West of Eyhorne Street, Eyhorne Street (Hollingbourne)		
Number of Support (1) / Object (5) / General Observations (1)			
Summary of issues		Officer Response	Proposed change
Lack of local services and facilities including school, health service and public transport.		Strategic and detailed policies ensure that the appropriate level of community infrastructure is provided for proposed development and appropriate contributions will be sought. There is now a resolution to grant planning permission subject to completion of a s106 agreement which will secure appropriate and justified contributions	No change.
Increased traffic/congestion, highway infrastructure insufficient		The magnitude of development anticipated on this site is not regarded as excessive. Some increase in traffic is inevitable but this is regarded as appropriate. Resolution to grant planning permission for 14 units. Kent	No change.

	Highways do not object.	
Detrimental impact on listed building and setting / historic centre / rural character.	Policies seek to enhance village identity and heritage, and strategic and detailed policies will ensure that appropriate account is taken of the character of existing settlements in detailed planning applications.	New policy formulation to strengthen heritage protection and policy on designated areas.
Inadequate infrastructure, including drainage.	Extensive consultation has taken place with the appropriate statutory providers to ensure adequate provision. There is now a resolution to grant planning permission subject to completion of a s106 agreement which will secure appropriate and justified contributions	New policy formulation to strengthen infrastructure requirements.
Loss of open fields/countryside. Some development on the road frontage may be acceptable.	Some loss of open land is inevitable to enable necessary development but this is kept to a minimum by strategic and detailed policies which encourage the use of previously developed land wherever possible. There is now a resolution to grant planning permission for 14 units.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection.
Detrimental to local community.	Not agreed.	No change.
Additional criteria proposed relating to heights, and materials of roofs, controlled lighting, increased GI throughout site and developer contributions for the maintenance of boundaries and PRoW in the KDAONB (AONB Unit).	Detailed policies determine the issues to be considered when a planning application is made, including scale and materials. There is now a resolution to grant planning permission for 14 units. This site is largely screened from the Kent Downs AONB by existing woodland and tress and the railway line to its north.	New policy formulation to strengthen countryside protection and policy on designated areas.
Some development on the road frontage may be acceptable	There is now a resolution to grant planning permission	No change
Planning application for 14 units only.	Noted.	No change.

