

APPENDIX D

Maidstone Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation October 2015

Omission sites that have previously been assessed

Site Ref	Location	Commentary	Recommendation
H1 (19) (HO-113)	Bell Farm North Street Barming	<p>The site promoters are seeking a significant westward extension to the development area of this allocated site. The proposed area would accord with the area proposed at the time of the Local Plan Inquiry into the MBWLP 2000.</p> <p>The Local Plan Inspector at the time recommended that the site should not be allocated for the following main reasons.</p> <p><i>'4.243 From the arguments that I heard at the inquiry I have considered the impact of housing on this site from two main areas: from a distance to the south in Lower Road looking across the Medway valley; and from close to in North Street.</i></p> <p><i>4.244 Dealing with the distant views first, I found on my visits in both summer and winter that the site can be clearly seen from various places in Lower Road, particularly from directly to the south in views which were not illustrated by the objectors' landscape witness. In these views, this edge of Maidstone has an attractive, rather diffuse character, described by this witness as "... a quite subtle merging of town and country. ..." (MB/PR.104, paragraph 3.14).</i></p> <p><i>4.245 At present the site contributes to the character and appearance of the area when seen from Lower Road because its openness contrasts with the housing development around it, and extends the rural character of the area to the west amongst that housing. The urban boundary is therefore not clear cut, and town and country merge in an attractive, subtle way. I have no doubt that this would change if the site were</i></p>	No Change

		<p><i>developed for housing since, even with the landscaping proposed, the green and open character of much of the site which I saw on my visits would be lost. The effect of housing, therefore, would be to consolidate the urban element in the area at the expense of the rural, and the subtlety of their merging would be lost.</i></p> <p><i>4.246 I agree with the objectors that housing on the site would not be extend the urban area along the valley since there is housing along its northern and southern boundaries. However, to my mind the opposite effect, of reducing the countryside incursion amongst the houses, is equally harmful. I do not agree with the objectors that the site does not appear as an obvious part of the countryside, particularly in those views directly from the south which were not illustrated at the inquiry. I accept that the western boundary is well treed, but the site still appears open, in marked contrast to the urban area to the east.</i></p> <p><i>4.247 The objection site is in an area which has no special landscape designation. However, I note the advice in paragraph 2.14 of PPG7 that the countryside should be protected for its own sake. Moreover, in Chapter 3 I have recommended that the Council should extend the Medway Valley ALLI to cover this area north of its present boundary. I conclude on this part of the issue, therefore, that housing on the site would materially harm the distant views of this part of Maidstone when seen from the south across the Medway valley.</i></p> <p><i>4.248 I turn now to consider the effect of the proposal on North Street. Architecturally the appearance of North Street is dominated by modern housing. Nevertheless, the extensive views west and south-westwards across the objection site from the northern end of the Street, and the views due south along it and across the Medway valley, give it a rural character to be expected on the edge of the town. This would be completely changed by housing on the objection site, even with the area of open space proposed on the eastern edge and which it has been agreed would be included in a site specific policy. The</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>rural views across the site, towards and beyond the shelter belt planting, would be replaced by views across urban open space towards housing. Even the extensive landscaping which is illustrated cannot alter the change from a rural to an urban character and appearance.</i></p> <p><i>4.249 My concern is reinforced when the illustrative road access proposals are considered. Whatever detailed design is chosen for the junctions proposed to give access to the objection site from North Street, they would introduce an urban form and scale wholly out of place in this largely rural setting. I note that traffic could be removed from the northern part of North Street, but this does not in any way overcome the harm that road proposals of this scale would cause.</i></p> <p><i>4.250 I accept the value of some of the elements in the design concept, internal landscaping, footways and cycleways, for example, but they do not address my concerns which are to the principle of development.</i></p> <p><i>4.251 For all these reasons I conclude on this issue that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of North Street, and the distant views of the area from Lower Road across the Medway valley.'</i></p> <p>The Inspector concluded that serious harm would arise sufficient to clearly outweigh the need for housing.</p> <p>The circumstances of the site have not changes in the interim period except that the Area of Local Landscape Value designation will not remain. The site is still visible across the Medway Valley which is part of the Medway Valley Landscape of Local Value.</p> <p>The physical characteristics of the site and its setting have not changed.</p> <p>Councillors should be advised that an application for 35 units on the allocated part of the site (adjacent to North Street) was REFUSED on 05/11/2015</p>	
--	--	---	--

H1 (25)	Tongs Meadow West Street Harrietsham	<p>This site was subject to Regulation 18 Consultation in March 2014 as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>Cabinet on 9 March 2015, following consideration of the Reg. 18 representations and advice from Natural England, recommended that it should not be allocated and should be subject to a further Regulation 18 consultation for its deletion on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'In view of the recent advice from Natural England (NE) that they would be unlikely to consider issuing an EPS (European Protected Species) Development License given the fact that the site is a receptor site for a previous development.'</i></p> <p>The site promoters consider that the site should be reinstated as an allocation as a revised development that excludes the former receptor site is being developed.</p> <p>There has been no new information submitted that clearly indicates that development on a reduced site area would now receive an EPS licence.</p>	No change
H1 (31)	Land at Ham Lane Lenham	<p>This site was subject to Regulation 18 Consultation in March 2014 as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>Cabinet on 2/4 February 2015, following consideration of the Reg. 18 representations, recommended that it should not be allocated and should be subject to a further Regulation 18 consultation for its deletion on the grounds</p> <p><i>'of (the) unacceptably 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.'</i></p>	No Change

		<p>The site was again considered by SPS&T Committee on 14/23 July 2015 who re-affirmed the earlier decision of Cabinet that the site should not be allocated for the same reasons.</p> <p>The site promoters are seeking the site's reinstatement into the local plan as an allocated site.</p> <p>Councillors are advised that application 14/502973/FULL for 82 units has been REFUSED and is currently subject to an appeal.</p> <p>It is considered that there have been no change in circumstances relating to the site to warrant Councillors previous decision being reversed.</p>	
H1 (57)	Land at Former Astor of Hever School Farm Oakwood Rd Maidstone	<p>This site has previously been recommended for allocation by officers on two occasions at Cabinet on 2/4 February 2015 and to SPS&T on 14/23 July 2015.</p> <p>Councillors resolved not to allocate the site on the grounds that <i>'the site is retained for education use and development would be unacceptably compromised by the lack of adequate access.'</i></p> <p>The applicants have resubmitted the highway information considered by Cabinet and SPS&T Committee and the information relating to the status of the land by the site promoters KCC</p> <p>The circumstances have not changed in the interim period.</p>	No Change
H1 (64)	Land south of East Street Harrietsham (Bell Farm North)	<p>This site has previously been recommended for allocation by officers on two occasions at Cabinet on 2/4 February 2015 and to SPS&T on 14/23 July 2015.</p> <p>The site was not accepted for allocation by Cabinet for the following reasons;</p>	No Change

		<p><i>'The cumulative impact of development having 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 and unacceptable cumulative impact for the community for education provision, transport and other community infrastructure.'</i></p> <p>SPS&T Committee reaffirmed the earlier decision by Cabinet.</p> <p>The promoters are now seeking 45 units on the site.</p> <p>In other respects the circumstances of the site have not changed.</p>	
H1 69)	Land at Lodge Road Staplehurst	<p>This site has previously been recommended for mixed-use employment and residential allocation by officers on two occasions at Cabinet on 2/4 February 2015 and to SPS&T on 14/23 July 2015.</p> <p>The site was not accepted for allocation by Cabinet for the following reasons;</p> <p><i>'the site should be retained for employment use given the economic upturn and that infrastructure must be improved to enable this to happen and the cumulative impact of residential development in Staplehurst on social balance.'</i></p> <p>SPS&T Committee reaffirmed the earlier decision by Cabinet not to allocate the site with the proviso that the site should not be allocated solely on the need to retain its employment designation.</p> <p>There have been no further change in circumstances since SPS&T Committee last considered the site</p>	No change
HO2-173	Land at Court Lodge	This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and	No change

	Road Harrietsham	<p>2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'Whilst this site is close to the village of Harrietsham and the services it provides, it lies within the open countryside and is somewhat disjointed from the existing built up area. Development of the site would have a detrimental effect on the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.'</i></p> <p>Councillors are advised that planning permission has been refused for development on this site and is subject to a current appeal for which a Hearing has recently been held. A decision is currently awaited.</p> <p>There has been no further change in circumstances relating to the site since the previous rejection to warrant a different conclusion.</p>	
HO3-203	78 Heath Road Coxheath	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercise on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'There are site-size and relationship to adjoining dwellings issues with this site. It is not considered likely that development in the form suggested could be satisfactorily achieved, certainly if access is required to be from B2163 Heath Road as it is now'.</i></p> <p>The site promoters have provided further information in the form of a plan that shows by demolishing an existing garage, an access of some 3.0m to 4.8m in width can be provided.</p> <p>However this runs immediately past the dwelling (not included in the proposed site) that is located at the front of the site and its use would therefore result in amenity issues to the occupiers of this dwelling.</p> <p>The previous decision should still stand.</p>	No change

<p>H03-230</p>	<p>Baltic Wharf St Peter's Street Maidstone</p>	<p>The promoter considers that this site should be allocated for a mixed retail/residential use.</p> <p>The site was considered by the SPS&T committee on 23/07/2015 in response to a Regulation 18 Representation the site should be allocated for a food store as part of a mixed use development.</p> <p>The report stated as follows:</p> <p>'4.19 A representation was received from the owners of Baltic Wharf, St Peters Street in Maidstone stating that their site should be allocated in the Local Plan for a large food store as part of a mixed use development.</p> <p>4.20 This representation to the Reg 18 Plan was made before the Public Inquiry into the Council's refusal of permission for a foodstore (A1 use class), offices (A2, B1), café/restaurant (A3) and assembly/leisure (D2) uses on the Baltic Wharf site was held in May 2014. The appeal Inspector concluded that a foodstore use was the only primary use which would secure the future of this Grade II listed building, provided a retailer would commit to the scheme and allowed the appeal in July 2014.</p> <p>4.21 The appeal Inspector highlighted what he regarded as an imbalance between the draft Local Plan's inclusion of a specific allocation for the Maidstone East/Sorting Office site and the lack of a policy for the Baltic Wharf building, a substantial listed building in the town centre. He stated this was not necessarily an incorrect approach, but the net result was that he gave little weight to the draft Local Plan at the point he was considering the appeal.</p> <p>4.22 Clearly the site now has planning consent; there is no need to allocate the site for the uses for which it has permission. Further, whilst other uses such as residential would be appropriate for the building, an allocation policy citing it as</p>	<p>No Change</p>
----------------	---	---	------------------

		<p>an alternative main use would not be deliverable based on the viability information so recently tested at the appeal.</p> <p>4.23 That said, there is merit in making reference to the site in the Local Plan as a substantial and underused listed building in the town centre, should the position on viability change over the lifetime of the Plan. It is recommended that the supporting text to Policy SP1 – Maidstone Town Centre be amended to confirm that, should the consented scheme not come forward, the Council will consider positively alternative schemes that achieve the retention and restoration of the listed building. Appropriate uses would include housing, offices, leisure uses, cafes and restaurants.'</p> <p>Taking account of the further representations from the site promoter, it is still considered that the above considerations remain valid. The Maidstone East/Sorting office site is still regarded as the priority location for new retail floorspace in the town centre; it is an edge of centre site with direct connections to the heart of the town centre. The Council will respond positively to proposals for the site that would deliver residential development (or an element of residential development) which help to secure the future of the listed building and officers would be happy to engage in pre-application discussions with the landowners to this end.</p>	
HO3-254	Granada House Lower Stone Street Maidstone	<p>This site was accepted but not allocated for development in the 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercise.</p> <p>The reason why it was not allocated was because it was located within the Town Centre Broad Location and also the Broad Location centred on the Mall Shopping Centre.</p> <p>The promoter considers that the site should be allocated for development and advises that preparations are under way for the submission of an application for a mixed use development of some 49 residential units (there are 20 on site at the</p>	No Change

		<p>present time) and commercial units at street level. Pre-application discussions have been held as well as a public exhibition.</p> <p>Given this and the fact that the emerging Local Plan gives broad support for development it is not considered necessary to allocate the site.</p>	
HO3-259 & H1 (68)	Land north of Pinnock Lane Staplehurst	<p>This larger site of between 22.4ha and 24ha in area was rejected following assessment in 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercise.</p> <p>The primary reason for this was that the Landscape Capacity Study which assessed the site individually concluded in terms of the site's Opportunities and Constraints as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of site is disproportionate to existing extent of Staplehurst • Crisp urban/rural divide between existing extent of Staplehurst and rural landscape to west does not lend itself well to further development • Site provides rural setting to Staplehurst and offers attractive views towards the existing settlement and church spire • Further development would not relate well to linear pattern of development to east • Development generally undesirable <p>There has been no change in circumstances to warrant a different decision</p>	No change
HO3-271	Land South of Cripple Street Loose	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercise. The suitability assessment concluded as follows;</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> <i>Development of this site would extend the urban boundary from Westwood Road and Sheppey Road further west and</i></p>	No change

		<p>would encroach on the gap between the urban area and the beginning of the gradual slope into the Loose Valley.</p> <p><i>This site contributes significantly to the rural character of the area as one leaves the urban edge along Cripple Street. Residential development here would have an unacceptable impact upon the setting of the Loose Valley Conservation Area. Unlike other sites at the urban edge in this location, there are no dwellings between the site and the Loose Valley, which serves to enhance its rural character and warrants protection.'</i></p> <p>Since that assessment was undertaken the site has been incorporated into the Loose Valley Landscape of Local Value.</p> <p>There have been no other changes to the circumstances of the site other than the permission allowed on appeal on the north side of Cripple Street. It is considered that this decision has rendered this site more important in its role as part of the setting of the Loose Valley and its Conservation Area given the fact that unlike the northern side of Cripple Street there is no built development between the site and the valley edge.</p> <p>The changes in circumstances of the site are not sufficient to warrant a different decision being made.</p>	
HO3-273	Land Adj. Ivan's Field Warmlake Road Chart Sutton	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercise on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'Development on the site is achievable. However, Chart Sutton is a village with very few services. Access to services in adjoining villages is likely to be by means of the private car given the poor bus service and the distances involved which would deter walking.</i></p> <p><i>Development on this site would represent a significant visual expansion of built development eastwards from the current limit of the village. The arbitrary boundary across the open</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>field is not related to any existing hedgerows /landscape features etc.'</i></p> <p>The promoter of the site considers that the recent appeal decision (13.04.2015) on Land at The Oaks Maidstone Road Sutton Valance (application 14/0830) to allow the construction of 10 dwellings is sufficient change in circumstances to allow development on this site.</p> <p>It is considered that there are differences between this site and the site where development has been allowed at appeal. Sutton Valance is designated as a larger village in the Council's preferred spatial development hierarchy and has a greater range of facilities than Chart Sutton including a primary school. The bus service is also more regular than that which serves Chart Sutton.</p> <p>It is considered therefore that there have been no changes in circumstances to warrant a different decision being made.</p>	
HO-15	Land at Stanley Farm (South of) Headcorn Road Staplehurst	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>Overall conclusions: There are a number of transport mitigation measures in order to bring forward development on this site. There would be a relatively high impact upon the character and appearance of the locality, as the site contributes significantly to the locality. These factors along with the uncertainty of having a developer linked to the site bring into question its deliverability. Coupled with the probable reliance on the car given the distance to public transport links mean that on balance it is recommended for rejection.'</i></p> <p>The greatest change since the assessment was undertaken is that there is now a developer involved. In fact, an outline application for up to 110 dwellings (15/507124/OUT) has been submitted, but currently remains undetermined.</p>	No change

		<p>The proposed site in the representations received is also significantly smaller than that previously proposed.</p> <p>The site is currently located within the Low Weald SLA as defined in the MBWLP 2000 and does fall within the Low Weald Landscape of Local Value as defined in Policy SP5 of the emerging Local Plan. Development of this site even in its reduced form would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the locality.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the reduction in site area from previous submissions it is considered that the site would represent an unacceptable extension of the village into the countryside. It is a site that remains separated from public transport links and is likely to lead to reliance on the use of the private car by future occupiers for their day-to-day needs.</p>	
HO-22	Land North of Cripple Street Loose	<p>The promoter considers that this site should be allocated following the recent appeal decision (03/11/2015) which allowed 36 units.</p> <p>Given that this is a full planning permission, it is not considered necessary to allocate the site</p>	No change
HO-64	Land at South Lane Sutton Valence	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'The landowner has given no indication in terms of the number of dwellings the site could accommodate. If the site were to be considered for residential development, taking into account its edge of village location, a low density development would be appropriate, with a potential yield of around 60 dwellings.</i></p> <p><i>However, notwithstanding the potential site capacity, it is not considered that this is an appropriate use for this site due to its</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>location. Indeed, whilst there may be no overriding consultee objections to delivering a residential scheme on this site, the redevelopment of the site would transform the existing character of the area; and there would be significant encroachment into the countryside that would harm the landscape and go against the pattern and grain of development in the surrounding area hereabouts.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to this, the site is located on greenfield land; and the site is not in easy access of a train station, local service centre, employment site or secondary school. It is therefore considered that the site should be rejected.'</i></p> <p>The site promoter considers that site should be allocated due to the continuing need to deliver greater housing numbers to meet the OAN and that the site is suitable as it is close to an identified larger village</p> <p>Since the last assessment, two appeal decisions on land opposite this site on the western side of South Lane have been made. Both have refused residential development. The key consideration in both cases was the need to maintain the existing gap between the upper village and the lower village at The Harbour to preserve the landscape character of the area.</p> <p>In the light of this and the fact that there has been no change since the last site assessment was undertaken, it is considered appropriate that the site is not allocated.</p>	
HO-65	(Part) Land at Mill Bank Headcorn	<p>This site is part of a larger site that was rejected following assessment in the 2013 SHLAA call-for-sites exercise on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'Although adjoining the northern part of the RSC, the site would appear as a relatively isolated development in the open countryside detached from the core of the village, which despite existing screening would be quite visible from the</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>highway; significant landscaping belts would be required to mitigate the visual impact upon the open countryside. Protected and non-protected trees may represent a constraint on development. There are ponds and watercourses within the site and ecological mitigation may be required.'</i></p> <p>This site represents the SE corner of that larger site</p> <p>The Landscape Capacity Study published in January 2015 also assessed the larger site and concludes as follows;</p> <p>'Landscape Character Sensitivity: Moderate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site adjoins A274 which is locally intrusive on the western site boundary • Generally reasonable hedgerows to boundaries with some trees • Stream with ponds and adjoining hedgerow and tree cover runs across the site • Public footpaths on the western boundary and crossing the site towards the east • Remote from Headcorn and site has a generally rural feel • Pond, streams and trees amidst pasture gives conservation interest • Limited area of large scale (nursery) development to the north • Heritage feature includes a listed building near the site • Evidence of loss of field pattern through hedgerow removal, however the site links with wider countryside and is characteristic of the Low Weald <p>Visual Sensitivity: High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive users of the strong footpath network around and crossing the sites are important in the flat landscape • Some generally filtered views from residential properties along the A247 Maidstone Road <p>Landscape Value: Moderate</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential conservation value • Sense of remoteness although tranquillity reduced in areas close to Maidstone Road • Listed building close by gives heritage interest • Generally attractive with scenic value and a rural feel despite hedgerow loss <p>Opportunities and Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low capacity to accommodate housing • Network of streams and vegetation • Opportunity to create a stronger rural boundary to the north • Retain rural character • Distant from urban centre of Headcorn and would substantially extend development into open countryside • Site acts as a green wedge between Headcorn and the settlement to the north <p>Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the green wedge function of the site • Network of streams and vegetation should be conserved • Create a stronger rural boundary to the north • Retain rural and undeveloped character' <p>It is considered that even with the reduced area proposed development of the site would result in a marked change to the character of the area by introducing a substantial additional length of developed frontage to Mill Bank and a consequent significant reduction in the gap between the pocket of development just south of Stonestile Road and the existing development along Mill Bank.</p> <p>It is thus considered that the site should not be allocated.</p>	
HO-74	Fant Farm Gatland Lane Maidstone	This site was recommended for inclusion in the draft Local Plan by officers following assessment in both the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises. It was rejected as an allocation site twice, most recently by Cabinet on 2/4 February 2015 who rejected the allocation of the site in the grounds that;	No change

		<p>'The site is valuable for agriculture use, and would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape, including the overall shape of the urban area of Maidstone and the unacceptable highways impact for the local community.'</p> <p>The promoters consider that site should be allocated given the continuing shortfall against the Objectively Assessed Need and that appropriate development would not result in the harm feared.</p> <p>The Council is planning to meet its Objectively Assess Need in full.</p> <p>There have been no other change in circumstances to warrant a different decision being made.</p>	
HO-94	Warmlake Business Park Maidstone Road Sutton Valence	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'Redevelopment would not cause significant visual harm to character or openness of countryside or harm to residential amenity.'</i></p> <p><i>The site currently contains commercial buildings, which do not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the countryside, and their replacement with housing could have a positive impact upon the setting of the adjacent listed building.</i></p> <p><i>However, the site is not closely related to a good range of facilities and many trips are likely to be made by car.</i></p> <p><i>Also, this site is in active employment use. Redevelopment would result in a loss of employment space in a rural area, which may impact upon local employment and thereby also upon sustainability.</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>On balance, considering the above, it is not recommended that this site be accepted. It is noted that there is the possibility of additional land adjoining this site – see HO-92 (Land to north of Redic House, Warmlake Road, Sutton Valence).'</i></p> <p>The promoter of the site considers that the recent appeal decision (13.04.2015) on Land at The Oaks Maidstone Road Sutton Valence (application 14/0830) to allow the construction of 10 dwellings is sufficient change in circumstances to allow development on this site.</p> <p>There are differences between this site and the site where development has been allowed at appeal despite the proximity of the two sites to each other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site at the Oaks is approximately 1.7ha in area and has a road frontage to the A274. • The proposed site is situated to the rear of existing development on an undeveloped part of the existing business park and amounts to 0.55ha in area. <p>In addition this existing developed area of this site is identified in policy DM18 of the Local Plan as an identified Economic Development Area and thus should be retained. This decision was confirmed by Cabinet on 12 January 2015.</p> <p>It is considered therefore that the site should not be allocated for residential development.</p>	
HO-131	Land at Maidstone Road Marden	<p>This site was part of a larger 30.44ha site rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'The indicated site capacity (500+ dwellings) would appear to be achievable on this 30.44ha site and there are no abnormal</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>constraints applying to the site as far as can be ascertained and the landowner is willing to release the land although no developer has been identified.</i></p> <p><i>However, development of this site would result in a substantial expansion of the settlement, out of scale with the existing village.</i></p> <p><i>The railway line currently acts as a physical limit to the extent of the village to the north east. Beyond this point existing development is limited, being sparsely distributed along Maidstone Road.</i></p> <p><i>Development of the site would introduce an intensive form of development in a location which is physically removed from the existing built area of the village. A development of this scale could also adversely impact on the setting of nearby listed properties.'</i></p> <p>The revised submission relates to the southernmost area (approx. 6.7ha) of the previously assessed larger site (the land between Church Farm and the railway-line including some additional land to the west and south of The Old Vicarage.</p> <p>It is considered that the same considerations relating to the harm arising from a substantial area of new development north of the existing railway line and the poor relationship to the existing built area of the village apply.</p> <p>The site should not be allocated.</p>	
HO-150	Land North of Vicarage Road Yalding	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'The site is a wooded area on the edge of the village. It would have a significant impact on the character of the area and this change, loss of woodland, ecological impacts are likely to be</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>unacceptable. Whilst there is now a developer on-board, there have been no changes in the circumstances of the site since the previous assessment that would lead to a different conclusion.'</i></p> <p>The agent now states that approximately 30 dwellings are proposed for the site (previously 60) and indicates that further survey work on ecology and trees has been undertaken (results not provided) that indicate the development would not result in the harm feared in the earlier assessments.</p> <p>Councillors may recall that at the meeting of the SPS&T Committee on 14/23 July 2015 a booklet illustrating a potential a development option for the site largely in the form described above was circulated as part of the urgent update report and it was recommended that the site not be allocated. Members did not recommend the allocation of the site at that meeting.</p> <p>There have been no change in circumstances in relation to the site</p>	
HO-154	Broomfield Park Kingswood	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'This site is rejected for the reasons listed in the suitability category. The proposed Eco village at this site is simply inappropriate to add on to a settlement the size of Kingswood.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed development is reliant on the delivery of a link road that has not been built despite years of effort on the parts of the County Council and the Borough Council.</i></p> <p><i>The combination of these factors alone means that this proposal would be unlikely to ever be delivered as outlined by the developers. However, the brief that the developers submitted also proposes the delivery of a cinema, a pub, a library, a medical centre, a new primary school, a new village</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>hall and light industrial units. While it is unlikely that all of these facilities are required to sustain a village, even one that is proposed to expand to the size that the developers propose for Kingswood, the delivery of all of this community infrastructure is doubtful in viability terms.</i></p> <p><i>The combination of these factors means that this site is not allocated for housing.</i></p> <p><i>There have been no changes in the material circumstances relating to the site since the previous assessment. Development on this site does not accord with the Council's preferred spatial strategy and there are serious concerns about deliverability and viability for the necessary infrastructure to serve the development. It is highly likely that it would not be deliverable within the timescale envisaged by the proposers.'</i></p> <p>There has been no change in circumstances relating to the site since the previous assessments.</p>	
HO-159	Land adj. Bensted Close Hunton	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'Residential development would constitute a significant encroachment into the countryside and would harm the open and rural character of the Special Landscape Area. The site is very flat and open and there are clear long distance views, particularly from West Street to the north east. There is a residential close adjacent to the site, but site is not part of an existing pattern of development. Development would harm the open, rural character of the Special Landscape Area.</i></p> <p><i>There would be some negative impact upon the setting of adjacent listed buildings and historic parkland, although the road does provide some separation.</i></p> <p><i>Although, the site is within walking distance of facilities in</i></p>	No change

		<p><i>Hunton village, these are very limited. Hunton is not a defined settlement and the site is not, therefore, considered well located in sustainability terms.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of any mixed use development, as proposed in the submission, this is generally an unsustainable location, with limited access to facilities. Also, such a development would have a similar visual impact upon the openness of the countryside. Therefore, this type of development would not materially alter the suitability conclusions.'</i></p> <p>The material circumstances and considerations relating to this site have not changed since the previous assessments to lead to a different conclusion being made.</p>	
HO-160	Land North of George Street Staplehurst (The Grange)	<p>This site was rejected following assessment in the 2013 and 2014 SHLAA Call-for-sites exercises on the following grounds;</p> <p><i>'The site is separated from the village of Staplehurst by open countryside. The council are currently defending an appeal for development to the south (car park for the station) which is considered to cause visual harm. Further development to the north of this site would cause additional harm. The railway line is considered a defined barrier that the Council would not wish to see development to the north of.</i></p> <p><i>Links to the village are poor, and would rely on a single point of access across the railway bridge. This is not a particularly pleasant environment for those on foot.</i></p> <p><i>There is a substantial amount of tree coverage within the site which would be impact by the proposal. I therefore conclude that this is an unsustainable site that is detached from the village centre. There would be significant visual harm should the site be developed. I therefore recommend that it be rejected.'</i></p>	No change

		<p>The agent has indicated that the development of the site would bring forward 22 over-60s dwellings 16 semi-detached bungalows Redevelopment of The Grange to create 1 and 2 bed over-60s apartments 6 detached family houses 18 2-bed homes for sale/rent to young families and elderly 'down-sizers' It is indicated that the site would be deliverable within 2 years.</p> <p>It is contended that given the existing development in the area, the need for this type of accommodation and the site's relative sustainability that the site should be allocated for development.</p> <p>There was an appeal decision (application 14/501185/OUT) for 22 dwellings on land immediately to the west of this larger site dismissed on 16 June 2015. The inspector concluded that that development would cause unacceptable harm to the countryside and was not sustainable albeit recognising that 22 dwellings would make a small contribution to the social role of development as outlined in the NPPF.</p> <p>Development of this larger site for a greater level of development would have a greater adverse impact on the character of the area and would it is considered given the 'target market' not be sustainable given the distance to community facilities in the village.</p> <p>It is not considered that the site should be allocated and that the physical circumstances of the site have not changed since previous assessments that would warrant a different conclusion being reached.</p>	
	The Mall King Street Maidstone	The agents acting for the owners of the shopping centre consider that the site should be designated as a Mixed-use site to include residential development.	No change

		<p>The same representation was considered by the SPS&T Committee on 19 August when the representations to the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation to Policy RMX1 sites were considered. The following response was agreed;</p> <p><i>'Redevelopment of The Mall is included in the Local Plan as a longer term redevelopment proposal as the site is more complex to deliver and the exact form and nature of development in this location will be the subject of further assessment and refinement in conjunction with the landowners. It is considered appropriate to identify this area as a broad location ahead of this more detailed work being done but this does not prevent redevelopment being delivered earlier in the plan period should the landowners decide to expedite it. The council is very willing to work constructively with the landowners to bring the site forward sooner.'</i></p> <p>The recommendation was that no change to the Local Plan be made and Councillors accepted this.</p> <p>There have been no changes in circumstances since and the same response to the latest representation is appropriate.</p>	
--	--	--	--