

Maidstone Borough Council

Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee

23 July 2015 adjourned from 14 July 2015

Item 10: Reconsideration of previously rejected Maidstone Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 Draft and 2014 SHLAA Housing sites.

Representations

A number of representations have been received in respect of site H1 (10): Land south of Sutton Road Maidstone objecting to development on the site and to its possible non-deletion as an allocation. These are attached at Appendix One for Member's attention.

Two representations in addition to the letter from Harrietsham Parish Council received prior to and circulated at the meeting on 14 July relating to the site known as H1 (64) Bell Farm North East Street Harrietsham have also been received. These are attached at Appendix Two for Members' attention.

A letter from Lenham Parish Council relating to site H1 (31) Ham Lane Lenham is also attached at Appendix Three

Officer comment

For Members' information the following table lists the decisions on those sites set out in the current agenda as originally considered by the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20th, 22nd and 28th January 2015 and subsequently by Cabinet on 2nd and 4th February 2015.

Maidstone Borough Local plan Regulation 18 Consultation Draft 2014 sites		
Site	OSC Recommendation	Cabinet decision
H1 (10): Land S of Sutton Rd	Agreed revised yield of 850 for Regulation 18 Consultation due to extent of change	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion
H1 (31) Ham Lane Lenham	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion
H1 (39) Ulcombe Road and Mill Bank Headcorn	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion
H1 (40) Grigg Lane and Lenham Rd Headcorn	Northern part of site recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion	Northern part of site recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion
H1 (41)	Recommended for Regulation 18	Recommended for Regulation 18

South of Grigg Lane Headcorn	consultation for deletion	consultation for deletion
H1 (42) Knaves Acre Headcorn	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion	Recommended for Regulation 18 consultation for deletion
SHLAA 2014 sites		
Site	OSC Recommendation	Cabinet decision
H1 (57) Former Astor of Hever School Farm site Oakwood Rd	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (61) Land at Cross Keys Bearsted	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (64) Bell Farm North, East St, Harrietsham	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (65) Land at Lenham Rd Headcorn	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (66) Land S of The Parsonage Goudhurst Rd Marden	Recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (67) Land S of Marden Rd Staplehurst	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (68) Lane to the N of Henhurst Farm Staplehurst	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation
H1 (69) Land at Lodge Rd Staplehurst	Recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation	Not recommended for Regulation 18 Consultation with a view to the site's allocation

For clarification the agreed minutes from the 9 June SPS&T Committee meeting state as follows:

‘RESOLVED

That the:

1) Additional sites considered and excluded from the Local Plan during the January/February/March 2015 cycle of Cabinet meetings be reconsidered (the sites deleted from the Regulation 18 version of the Plan (7 sites and 1 part site) and the allocation of more of the additional sites (15) resulting from the 2014 call for sites). Sites put forward by Ward Members with community support in Neighbourhood Plans during the further call for sites process and were borderline rejections from the SHLAA to also be re-considered.

2) Following sites are not to be re-considered:

H1 (25) Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham

H1 (60) Fant Farm, Maidstone

H1 (48) Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea

Voting: For 4 Against 3 Abstain 1’

I would also advise Members that I wish to recommend a further change to Regulation 18 site H1 (4): Oakapple Lane Barming. This has occurred following a reconsideration of the site’s relationship with the existing woodland and countryside at this urban edge location. It is considered appropriate for an area of 1.5ha of open space to be provided at the western end of the site to improve the relationship between the built development and countryside beyond, resulting in a net loss of some 45 units with the approximate revised yield being 187 units. A revised site plan is attached at Appendix Four and Members are requested to agree the change for Regulation 19 Consultation.

Amendments to recommendation

In respect of site H1 (4) Oakapple Lane Barming: Members agree the revised site plan that now includes 1.5ha of open space and a reduced indicative yield of 187 units to go forward to Regulation 19 Consultation

APPENDIX ONE

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 23 July 2015 11:02
To: Steve Clarke
Subject: FW: Site H1 10 Sutton Road

Rob Jarman
Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

t 01622 602214 w www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk For appointments please contact: e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk
t 01622 602288

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Williams [mailto:pwref1@aol.com]
Sent: 23 July 2015 09:27
To: Rob Jarman
Cc: Langley; jameswalker@thekmgroupp.co.uk; stephen.eighteen@downsmail.co.uk
Subject: Site H1 10 Sutton Road

Dear Sir

We strongly object to the development of this site for housing.

I live at Simons Wood, Sutton Road right opposite St Mary Church. This particular area has significant vista's of the church and surrounding landscape. Please drive South, down Sutton Road from Rumwood Nursery and see for yourself the vista with the Church in the background!
This would be lost forever with the housing development proposed!

Please note we are not NIMBY's

We had no objection to the developments further along Sutton Road as they are in an area which is already built upon which had no real visual impact on the area.

However, the further development of another 850 houses on this road is madness!

Sutton road as you are fully aware, is the main artery for the Sutton Valence/Headcorn traffic. We have no main road out onto the M20 motorway from this road. Traffic has three routes available.

1. Through Leeds Village - which is not designed for the existing traffic levels, let alone the extra expected from the current housing developments on Sutton Road.
2. Willington Street - Again, already heavily used, especially in the rush hour periods.
3. Through Maidstone Town Centre - Yet again a major traffic congested route!

Langley is a very old parish and should be allowed to remain so. It will be a very large stain on MBC to allow Langley to be swallowed and incorporated into the main town of Maidstone by permitting this development right up to the border of the Parish!

Please also note.

The plans put forward by DHA/Countywide at the Public Consultation just recently held in Langley do not align with plans on the MBC Agenda for tonights 5pm Strategic Planning Development and Transport Meeting. The plans shown at the Langley meeting have housing right up to the border of existing Langley housing. The green area has been omitted???

Please think of the very negative outlook this development will have for future generations. We cannot continually lose our villages in this country with developments that do not allow green spaces as separation. Our country villages are the envy of the world! Let's not lose another one by permitting this planning to proceed

Regards

Peter Williams

M Inst. R

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 23 July 2015 10:30
To: Steve Clarke
Subject: FW: Objection to H1 10 Sutton Rd South

Rob Jarman

Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

☎ 01622 602214 www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk

For appointments please contact: ✉ louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk ☎ 01622 602288

From: Gordon P gmotogwp@live.co.uk
Sent: 23 July 2015 10:02
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: Objection to H1 10 Sutton Rd South

Mr Jarman, I feel compelled to put my objections to a planning application, for the first time in my life. We think it's absurd, and quite frankly ridiculous, to expect our area to take yet another massive development. This proposal is 40% larger than shown on the local plan. However, that is rather irrelevant because this should not go ahead at any size.

We see no reason why DHA/Countryside should be allowed to build yet another 850 houses, as there are already hundreds and hundreds of houses being built on both sides of this road, adjacent to the proposed site. The properties already agreed must be enough to more than satisfy the requirement for housing in this area. We've seen no queues of people outside developer's sales offices.

Where are the new jobs in this area, or are we just building here so people travel further to their jobs? No doubt a percentage of these houses will be bought up by the 'vultures' of the property market, the buy to let people, who will continue to fill both their 'portfolios' and their wallets, on the back of our younger adults who can't get or afford mortgages, so have to live a life of paying rent to no end.

Very importantly, this development would take away any greenbelt 'buffer' between Langley Village and Maidstone. As residents in Langley for over 21 years we feel that this is just too much over-development. The density, which I believe is 35/hectare, is completely out of character with the surrounding area. Less than 5, detached, properties per acre with 4 or 5 bedrooms would fit much better and there should be a demand for this, as only a very small proportion of the sites under construction provide for this end of the market. Even when they are included, they're mixed in with smaller properties which makes them much less desirable and of lower value.

For as long as we've lived in Langley there's been promise after promise concerning a relief road, to take traffic off the Leeds Road. Many of the new residents of these thousands of houses will want to access the M20. History shows that they don't cut through along Horseshoes lane, as one experience of meeting a bus or truck on that lane has always put them off. They carry on to Five Wents and turn down Leeds Road (B2163). The traffic along our stretch of the road is intolerable at either end of the day. The queues to get out of Leeds road at Five Wents tails back several hundred yards, across our driveway, in both the morning and evening rush hours. The recent traffic survey carried out showed a vehicle movement number that any 'A' road would be proud of. Plus we still get more than 10, full sized, 40 Tonne trucks coming through, in spite of the +17.5 Tonne ban.

We ask you to put a halt to this mad rush to cover the nearby fields with houses, both on Sutton road and the Langley side of Leeds. Also, the Maidstone and KCC planning departments need to realise that the South

Eastern relief road (formerly Leeds/Langley Bypass) is needed now and not when all the new builds are occupied and we have gridlock.

*Gordon & Liz Prout
Leeds Road,
Langley (Village at the moment).*

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 20 July 2015 16:36
To: 'Margaret & Duncan'
Cc: Steve Clarke
Subject: RE: H 1 10 Sutton Road Langley site for 850 homes

Dear Margaret,

Your objections will be considered when councillors discuss this potential allocation on Thursday at SPST Committee.

Regards

Rob Jarman
Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

t 01622 602214 w www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk For appointments please contact: e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk
t 01622 602288

-----Original Message-----

From: Margaret & Duncan [<mailto:mandmac@tiscali.co.uk>]
Sent: 20 July 2015 15:13
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: H 1 10 Sutton Road Langley site for 850 homes

Dear Mr. Jarman, As a Langley resident, I am writing on behalf of my husband and I to object to the above for the following reasons:

1. It is far too large and will mean we will lose our village status and just become an extension of Maidstone town.
2. No transport improvements have been allowed for. We have lived here for nearly 30 years and we have been waiting for a promised bypass all that time. We are already dreading the impact that will occur when the residents of the new houses already being built move in. The planners of the new site seem to think all the residents will go into Maidstone to work when, in fact, we know most will use the Langley and Leeds main road to go through to the M20 and commute. As the recent chaos caused by Operation Stack has shown us, we cannot cope with more disruption.

I hope you will give our objections some serious thought, Yours sincerely, Margaret MacIntyre.

Sent from my iPad

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 20 July 2015 16:43
To: 'Adam Hume'
Cc: jameswalker@thekmgroupp.co.uk, stephen.eighteen@downsmail.co.uk, Paulina Stockell (Cllr); helen.whatley.mp@parliament.uk, Steve Clarke
Subject: RE: Proposed Langley development

Dear Mr Hume,

Your objections (along with others) will be considered at this Thursday's SPST Committee in relation to this proposed draft housing allocation.

Regards

Rob Jarman

Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

t 01622 602214 w www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk

For appointments please contact: e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk t 01622 602288

From: Adam Hume [mailto:adam.hume@gmail.com]
Sent: 20 July 2015 13:45
To: Rob Jarman
Cc: jameswalker@thekmgroupp.co.uk, stephen.eighteen@downsmail.co.uk, Paulina Stockell (Cllr); helen.whatley.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: Proposed Langley development

To: Rob Jarman, Head of Planning, Maidstone Borough Council, Maidstone House King Street
Maidstone ME15 6F

Copy to: James Walker The KM group
Stephen Eighteen, Downsmail
Pauline Stockell, Councillor
Helen Whatley, MP

Dear Mr Jarman,

I am sending this email in advance of a meeting I understand is due to take place on Thursday 23rd July at 5.00pm at which the proposal H1 (10) Sutton Road South Site/DHA Countryside Properties is due to be discussed. I will submit this as "traditional letter" in the post to you but wanted to make sure it reached you before the meeting.

Please be advised that as a resident I am totally against the proposal as it stands for the following reasons:

I have been a resident of Langley since 2010 and live directly on the A247. I discovered through a friend in the village that there was to be a "Public Consultation" meeting to be held in the village hall on the 17th and 18th July.

Due either to incompetence or underhandedness however not a single resident living directly on the A274 for 500 meters either side of our house received one of the supposed 400 leaflets distributed by DHA/Countrywide. I know, I canvassed as many of my near residents as possible suggesting they attend as soon as I heard about the meetings and without exception they were had been as in the dark as I had been. Not a very good start for the most effected residents not to be invited to the consultation?

At the Friday meeting at the hall I was astonished to see that all that I had thought had been promised to Langley residents by your committee was absent from the proposal. No Green Buffer Zone/anti coalescence strip which would mean Langley as a village will (if passed) disappear to be swallowed up into Parkwood/Maidstone; no apparent improvement in the surrounding infrastructure (Drainage or Sewerage, and I hardly need to mention the state of traffic on the A274 surely? We residents have suffered a double whammy recently in addition to the increase in both private and commercial traffic with both the delays caused by the developments nearer to Maidstone at Parkwood and bursts of additional traffic caused by the repeated use of Operation Stack.

As a resident who lived directly on the Sutton Road in Langley I despair at this increase. When I moved here in 2010 it used to take me a maximum of 15 minutes to drive the 4 miles from home to the centre of Maidstone at the busiest rush hour time or school collection time. Two weeks ago at 3pm (when Operation stack was not in force) it took me 50 minutes to get as far as the Wheatsheaf junction when I gave up, turned round and went shopping in Ashford instead!

There appears to be no current or planned major infrastructure changes either to accommodate these new proposals. With no nearby rail line and therefore no possibility of a station and its roads are already choked with traffic - where is the proposed bypass to alleviate some of that congestion?

--

Adam Hume

Adam Hume Fine Furniture

www.adamhume.co.uk

Tel: 01835 898092

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 21 July 2015 12:05
To: 'WHATELY, Helen'
Cc: Steve Clarke; Sue Whiteside; James Bailey
Subject: RE: Constituent of Helen Whately MP: Mr and Mrs P Clifford

These objections will be considered at this Thursday's SPST and in any planning application.

Regards

Rob Jarman

Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

☎ 01622 602214 www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk

For appointments please contact: [e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk) ☎ 01622 602288

From: WHATELY, Helen [<mailto:helen.whately.mp@parliament.uk>]
Sent: 21 July 2015 10:48
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: Constituent of Helen Whately MP: Mr and Mrs P Clifford

Dear Mr Jarman

Peter & Margaret Clifford
Langley Oast, Langley Park Farm, Sutton Road Maidstone, Kent. ME17 3NQ

Ref: Site H1 10 site Sutton Road South/DHA Countryside Properties

Helen has been contacted by her constituents, Mr and Mrs Peter and Margaret Clifford regarding the above development site about which they have outlined a number of objections. Their email is copied below, which includes a copy of a letter sent to you directly. Helen would be grateful if you could please provide some advice on their concerns in order to assist with her response to the Cliffords.

Best wishes,
Alison

Alison Eardley
Office of Helen Whately MP
Member of Parliament for Faversham and Mid Kent
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

www.helenwhately.co.uk

From: margaret clifford [<mailto:margaretclifford@btinternet.com>]
Sent: 20 July 2015 19:42
To: WHATELY, Helen
Subject: Fw: - Site H1 10 site Sutton Road South/DHA Countryside Properties

Dear Miss Whateley

please find below a copy of an email that we have sent to Maidstone Borough Council Planning Dept hoping that you will be able to help us in this matter

regards

Peter & Margaret Clifford, Langley Oast, Langley Park Farm, Sutton Road Maidstone, Kent. ME17 3NQ tel: 01622 363520

On Monday, 20 July 2015, 18:23, margaret clifford <[redacted]@btinternet.com> wrote:

Dear Mr Jarman

We object to the proposed planning application for the following reasons:-

- 1: We live in Langley Park Farm which until recently was the start of the countryside on the outskirts of Maidstone. We have access over the single track lane between us and the Sutton Road. When the farm was sold for conversion to homes we had to pay for the tarmac topcoat to the lane and still have to pay for the upkeep of the lane. On the outline of the site for H1 10 Sutton Road South this lane has disappeared !!! Residents also paid for Gas and Water pipes through the field which is part of the site, what will happen to these ?
- 2: When the plans for the Wimpey site named "Langley Park" were published the Golf Driving Range was classed as an amenity for the site and the area. On the plans for the H1 10 site the Golf Driving Range has disappeared!!!!
- 3: 35 houses per acre is far too many for the site and will turn this pleasant area into a concrete jungle. We already have problems with electric power cuts and water pressure, these extra houses will make things even worse.
- 4: Getting in and out of Maidstone is a problem already and with the 2000 extra houses in the process of being built things are likely to get worse, so Please, Please, Please say NO to this new development

You say that there are no more Brown fill sites left in Maidstone, surely this is wrong. What about the KIG site this is Brown Fill site. Houses there would have access to the M20 via J8 also the A20 into Ashford and Maidstone. If there were a problem on either road then the other road could easily be accessed. Railway stations are also nearby in both Bearsted and Hollingbourne. This must be a much better place to put any extra houses that Maidstone might need in the future.

Finally we object to the fact that Cheryl Maggio-Taylor as Chairman of Langley Parish Council and who is therefore the spokesperson for the residents of Langley has been denied the chance to speak on our behalf at the meeting on the 23rd July at Maidstone Town Hall. This impinges not just on her rights but also on the rights of all Langley residents to the Freedom of Speech which has long been a right to the English people.

Peter and Margaret Clifford

Langley Oast, Langley Park Farm, Sutton Road, Langley, ME17 3NQ

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 21 July 2015 12:17
To: Steve Clarke; Sue Whiteside; James Bailey
Subject: FW: re:- Site H1 10 site Sutton Road South/DHA Countryside Properties

Rob Jarman

Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

☎ 01622 602214 [w www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk](http://www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk)

For appointments please contact: [e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk) ☎ 01622 602288

From: margaret clifford [margo.langleyeast@btinternet.com]
Sent: 20 July 2015 18:23
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: re:- Site H1 10 site Sutton Road South/DHA Countryside Properties

Dear Mr Jarman

We object to the proposed planning application for the following reasons:-

- 1: We live in Langley Park Farm which until recently was the start of the countryside on the outskirts of Maidstone. We have access over the single track lane between us and the Sutton Road. When the farm was sold for conversion to homes we had to pay for the tarmac topcoat to the lane and still have to pay for the upkeep of the lane. On the outline of the site for H1 10 Sutton Road South this lane has disappeared !!! Residents also paid for Gas and Water pipes through the field which is part of the site, what will happen to these ?
- 2: When the plans for the Wimpey site named "Langley Park" were published the Golf Driving Range was classed as an amenity for the site and the area. On the plans for the H1 10 site the Golf Driving Range has disappeared!!!!
- 3: 35 houses per acre is far to many for the site and will turn this pleasant area into a concrete jungle. We already have problems with electric power cuts and water pressure, these extra houses will make things even worse.
- 4: Getting in and out of Maidstone is a problem already and with the 2000 extra houses in the process of being built things are likely to get worse, so Please, Please, Please say NO to this new development

You say that there are no more Brown fill sites left in Maidstone, surely this is wrong. What about the KIG site this is Brown Fill site. Houses there would have access to the M20 via J8 also the A20 into Ashford and Maidstone. If there were a problem on either road then the other road could easily be accessed. Railway stations are also nearby in both Bearsted and Hollingbourne. This must be a much better place to put any extra houses that Maidstone might need in the future.

Finally we object to the fact that Cheryl Maggio-Taylor as Chairman of Langley Parish Council and who is therefore the spokesperson for the residents of Langley has been denied the chance to speak on our behalf at the meeting on the 23rd July at Maidstone Town Hall. This impinges not

just on her rights but also on the rights of all Langley residents to the Freedom of Speech which has long been a right to the English people.

Peter and Margaret Clifford
Langley Oast, Langley Park Farm, Sutton Road, Langley, ME17 3NQ

email to :- ~~robjarman@maidstone.gov.uk~~
copy to :- ~~taylormaggie@btopenworld.com~~

Mr Rob Jaman
Head of Planning
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
MAIDSTONE
ME15 6F

Mrs A D Froud
"Elmhurst"
Sutton Road
Langley
MAIDSTONE
Kent ME17 3LZ

21st July 2015

Dear Mr Jarman

Re:- Site H1 10 Sutton Road South Site/DHA Countryside Properties - Strategic Planning

Complaints

Where do I start ? Having lived at my home for almost 40 years and been refused numerous times to build on my own property and yet you are proposing for planning 850 homes out the back of my property. I really can not and do not believe that any surveying has been carried out to accommodate such a plan.

My Complaints:-

Not got the decency to notify residents that it affects - Nothing received by anyone living in SAME Location as myself - A neighbour accidentally found out from a friend in Langley Village

Absolute NO NOTICE GIVEN TO ANYONE FOR DHA Meeting in the Village Hall on Fri 17th July and Sat 18th July 2015

Extremely SHORT NOTICE to complain to the Council before Meeting at Town Hall on Thurs 23rd July 2015

Where's the Water coming from? Every year on a hose pipe ban water so short ?

Having lived in Sutton Road Langley - A274 with many Accidents on this Road due to unable to Cope with the current traffic - let alone More!!!! The hugh lorries that use this road to go to Parkwood Industrial estate are unable to pass one another on the stretch of A274 from the Plough Public House to the Horseshoes Public House - without stopping and slowly Crawling pass each out.

What's happened to the Leeds/ Langley bypass which we have been waiting for, some almost forty years and STILL WAITING! - the roads can not cope with this traffic.

The three Housing Estates which are in process at this moment being built are causing so much Havoc without MORE DISRUPTION, The whole area will be grid lock!. The new roundabout at Langley Park isn't coping with current traffic, and an Accident happened there as soon as opened!

The foot path far too small to cope with pedestrains and cyclists

Horseshoes Public House - Opposite Empty and Not Sold - (Eye Sore) and yet Proposing to build a new Pub / restaurant (Another one to Close)

Horseshoes Lane - Yes it's a Lane and unable to cope with the traffic at moment, Especially with the Bus Service and Cars and vans trying to pass the Buses - its really a Joke. It's a Lane.!

All our properties will be devalued if this Build goes ahead! Who's paying for our HUGH LOSSES!

My beautiful view will be Blocked by Housing.

The BACK HANDED way that the whole lot has been done, with NOT INFORMING residents and TRYING TO RUSH IT THROUGH before we object. - The DHA meeting in the Village Hall on Saturday 18th July - was EXTREMELY NEGATIVE to this proposed development
You could have cut the atmosphere. We all feel that you have tried to pull the wool over our eyes. Langley is my home, Where do you all live that are proposing this for us? Certainly not Langley!
How would all of you like your homes disrupted ? It doesn't seem to matter to you as its not affecting you that are proposing the planning.

No consideration taken for anyone living at Langley, don't we get a say?

I and all others hope that this Plan is stopped and not carried through,

From a very sad home owner.

Alison

Mrs A Froud

email - jan16jj@hotmail.co.uk (Sister)

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 22 July 2015 08:06
To: Steve Clarke
Subject: FW: H1 10 Sutton Rd South Site/DHA Countryside Properties

Rob Jarman

Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

☎ 01622 602214 www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk

For appointments please contact: ✉ louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk ☎ 01622 602288

From: Jane Mannering [maltoerslipknotdesign7@hotmail.co.uk]
Sent: 21 July 2015 20:01
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: H1 10 Sutton Rd South Site/DHA Countryside Properties

Dear Mr Jarman

Re: H1 10 Sutton Rd South Site / DHA Countryside Properties

With reference to the above proposal we write to strongly object and convey our incredulity that it has been brought forward once again for consideration.

As residents of Langley who will be directly affected by additional expansion over and above the existing developments in the vicinity, which will currently see the population of Langley more than double, we are deeply concerned about the damaging effects this proposal will have on an area already exhausting capacity on the local infrastructure. Even at this early stage, before the existing new builds are inhabited, the roads are close to gridlock at peak times, the nearest sizable supermarket on the Sutton Road is often jammed with customers struggling to complete their weekly shop and getting into Maidstone town centre can exceed 40 minutes for what should be a 7 minute journey. The Leeds Road and Willington Street will struggle to support the additional traffic to the motorway as it is and the knock on effect locally will be hugely destructive.

With the prospect of such high density housing being considered, you can perhaps understand our deep concerns, especially when one considers that as recently as June 2010 the Government stated, in a change of policy, that objections based primarily on density or over development may be accepted as persuasive arguments against permission being granted. Indeed, we believe this has now been included in the National Planning Policy Framework and adds to the previous grounds for refusal that focused on the detrimental effect on the character of a neighbourhood as well as the residential amenities.

In addition to the above concerns, the area for consideration is also a greenfield site in the heart of the Kent countryside. Known as the Garden of England and with Maidstone

as its County town, it seems quite insane that a further development of any size could be allowed to swamp the village of Langley. A previous application for the same site was rejected earlier this year and we fully applaud the decision made then by Borough Councillors fulfilling their remit to represent their residents, yet this new scheme is incredibly some 40% larger! We find it hard to believe that a more suitable brown field site cannot be located.

In conclusion, we understand that our Parish Council share these concerns and they too wholly object to this proposal in its entirety and will be campaigning on behalf of the residents of Langley to ensure this proposal is rejected again by the Strategic Planning Sustainability and Transport Committee on Thursday 23rd July. On a very basic level it is clear that this plan is neither strategic nor sustainable with regard to transport.

Yours sincerely
Jane & Paul Mannering

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 22 July 2015 22:37
To: Steve Clarke
Subject: Fwd: H1 Sutton ROad

Sent from Samsung Mobile on O2

----- Original message -----

From: W F Milford <[REDACTED]>
Date: 22/07/2015 16:58 (GMT+00:00)
To: Rob Jarman <robjarman@maidstone.gov.uk>
Cc: Langley <langleygc@hotmail.co.uk>
Subject: H1 Sutton ROad

re. H1 Error! Hyperlink reference not valid./DHA Countyside Properties - Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee Meeting Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.

Dear Sir.

With reference to the above noted site I would confirm my objection to this proposal.

I have lived in Troon House in the Sutton Road for the last 28 years.

In the last 18 months development has imploded in the Sutton Road and the sites are easy to see without listing them.

Living in this area dealing with all the roadworks associated with access to those developments, have been a traffic nightmare, with the worst to come, once the sites are fully occupied.

To include yet another development of that magnitude is suicidal.

The pressure on services and main road access from the A274 is not justifiable and is unsustainable.

It's one thing to build the site roads to residential standards but all roads lead to Rome ! ie the Sutton Road and that's one step to far.

We will need a motorway if you carry on with loading this end of Maidstone with your shortfalls in securing the adoption of your local plan.

MBC have been negligent in identifying there housing needs and have left the rate payers of MBC at risk to these speculative applications.

Do the right thing for the people who pay your salaries and refuse this application which will no doubt be appealed and left to the Inspectorate to decide, which still leaves us at risk.

Regards

Bill Milford

APPENDIX TWO

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 22 July 2015 13:22
To: Steve Clarke
Cc: Andrew Jolly
Subject: FW: Planning Application for Bell Farm North (H1/19)

Rob Jarman
Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

t 01622 602214 w www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk For appointments please contact: e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk
t 01622 602288

-----Original Message-----

From: harris@harris-howland-plus.com [mailto:harris@harris-howland-plus.com]
Sent: 22 July 2015 10:09
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: Planning Application for Bell Farm North (H1/19)

Ann and Harris Howland
The Martins
East Street
Harrietsham
Kent ME17 1HH

Dear Mr Jarman

We wish to object most strongly to the re-application for planning permission on the above site, which has been previously rejected by Maidstone Borough Council. Harrietsham has had 370 homes approved since 2011 - a staggering 45% increase in the size of our village.

This site is wholly unsuitable because it is adjacent to the historic conservation area and will ruin the character of the village. It is also right next to the CTRL site which has already been granted approval for 114 houses, adding more will create an unacceptable, vast, urban sprawl. Undoubtedly this will have a detrimental effect on the character, size and shape of the village and community due to the increase in size and footprint of the village.

Harrietsham has an enviable reputation as a friendly and welcoming place to live and all our newcomers have been treated kindly, but now the limits have been reached and our infrastructure cannot stand yet more houses being built without our village becoming nothing more than an extension of the urban scrawl of Maidstone town. We want the idea of any more extra large developments in our village to be scrapped.

Yours sincerely

Steve Clarke

From: Rob Jarman
Sent: 22 July 2015 16:12
To: Steve Clarke
Subject: FW: Planning Application for Bell Farm North (H1/19)

Rob Jarman

Head of Planning and Development
Maidstone Borough Council
Maidstone House
King Street
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

☎ 01622 602214 www.digitalmaidstone.co.uk

For appointments please contact: [e louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk](mailto:louisebarker@maidstone.gov.uk) ☎ 01622 602288

From: Barry Dynes [<mailto:barry.dynes@iscali.co.uk>]
Sent: 22 July 2015 14:48
To: Rob Jarman
Subject: Planning Application for Bell Farm North (H1/19)

Deanna and Barry Dynes
East Dene
East Street
Harrietsham
Kent ME17 1HH.

Dear Mr Jarman

We are horrified to learn that Bell Farm Harrietsham is being re-considered for planning permission on the above site which has previously been rejected by Maidstone Borough Council. Any development would add to the 45% already approved which amounts to 370 houses since 2011..

This site is totally unsuitable for future development as it is adjacent to the conservation area and will totally ruin the historic area.

The CTRL site has already been granted the construction of 114 houses and will be right next door to the Bell Farm site.

This is a lovely village and should remain so. Further massive development will leave the area dotted with developments and have a detrimental effect on everyone already living in this village.

The services will not be able to cope. The local primary school is already oversubscribed and will not be able to cope with the

inevitable influx of many children of primary age, we have heard of no plans to double or treble the size of the school which will

be needed to cope with the extra children. All the surrounding schools are also oversubscribed.

The Len Valley Medical Practice is shared between Harrietsham and Lenham and their services to the residents will inevitably

be stretched to breaking point if any further development takes place.

Kent must not be allowed to become a concrete jungle of roads and houses without villages and lovely countryside such as

we have in Harrietsham.

We hope that you will consider our very strong opposition to this development.

Yours sincerely

Deanna and Barry Dynes

APPENDIX THREE

Strategic Planning
Maidstone House
Maidstone
ME15 6JQ

Lenham Parish Council
13 Mercer Drive
Harrietsham
ME17 1AY

23rd July 2015

FAO: Strategic Planning, Sustainability & Transport Committee.

Dear Committee Members

With reference to discussions pertaining to the re-consideration of a previously submitted site at Ham Lane Lenham, we wish the following objections to be considered.

- Previously given arguments resulting in the Cabinet decision to remove this site for development purposes, including:
- Views from South to North looking onto AONB would be impacted upon to detriment of existing populace.
- Reduction of agricultural land and removal of trees would add to the carbon footprint in the area.
- Safety concerns regarding the heavy articulated lorry use of Ham Lane on a 24hrs/7 days a week scenario.
- Any crossing facility in the vicinity of the proposed development would cause serious tail-back situations in both directions on Ham Lane, thus causing increased congestion for entry from and to the A20, especially during 'rush hour' traffic and when operation stack is in force.
- The unacceptable adverse impact on the AONB and on the character of the village because it is peripheral to the settlement and beyond the open space occupied by Swadelands School playing field.
- Any development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside, including the setting of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, due to its size preventing adequate and acceptable landscaping design.
- Building on this site would lose any protection to nearby ancient woodland of Dickley Wood.
- Coalescence to Harrietsham would occur and prevent the view from the West along the A20 opening up to both the North and the South on entering the Lenham Village envelope in contravention of existing policy criteria.
- From the agenda item 4 from last Tuesday considerable support has been given by the Planning Officer to the views to and from the AONB.
- The publication of the Jacobs Landscape Capacity Study, in particular the views expressed re Harrietsham to Lenham Vale and the East Lenham Vale and relevant limitation of development therein, specifically against ribbon development and maintenance of the rural importance of Lenham.

We would appreciate you taking into consideration the above points.

Sent on behalf of Lenham Parish Council to:

Cllrs. D Burton, C English, F Gooch, S Griggs, T Harwood, S Paine, V Springett, N de Wiggondene, F Wilson, J Sams, T Sams.

APPENDIX FOUR

H1 (4) - OAKAPPLE LANE, BARMING



