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1 Preface

This document has been produced by:
Planning and Development
Ashford Borough Council,
Civic Centre,
Tannery Lane,
Ashford,
Kent
TN23 1PL
Email: ashfordldf@ashford.gov.uk

Large print copies, translations, audio and Braille versions of this document are available by telephoning Planning and Development on 01233 330229.
2 Introduction

2.1 The Tenterden and Rural Sites Development Plan Document (DPD) will be part of the Local Development Framework (LDF). Its principal role is to identify new sites for development outside the Ashford Growth Area, but it will also include several topic-based planning policies that cover specific rural planning issues.

2.2 The DPD is now at an ‘Issues and Options’ stage. This initial stage is designed to highlight the main planning policy issues that are facing the rural parts of the Borough and outline what the main options are for addressing those issues. It represents an early opportunity for you to let the Council know your opinions and to help influence the content of the DPD as it takes shape. These issues are referred to in Section 2 of this Report.

2.3 The Council has already, as part of this Issues and Options stage, undertaken some preliminary background work and initial consultation exercises.

2.4 In July 2007, landowners/stakeholders were invited, by advertisement, to submit sites that they felt were suitable for development in the rural area. This information allowed the Council to gauge an initial understanding as to the location and current availability of any rural land being promoted.

2.5 In addition to the site submission exercise, the Council has also been involved in a series of Rural Community Workshops in Tenterden and the villages that are mentioned in policy CS6 of the Councils Submitted Core Strategy, as these are the places where the Council has decided it should look first for suitable development sites.

2.6 The workshops gave the opportunity for an invited cross section of the local community to discuss the issues facing their settlement and the options for development in that location. All of the outcomes from the different workshops have been incorporated in this Issues and Options Report in section 1 and there is an opportunity for you to comment on these outcomes and on some specific questions that arise from them.

2.7 In publishing this Report, we must stress that the Council has made no decisions in respect of any of the potential sites or topic-related options referred to in this report. The views expressed in the village workshops are those of the local residents and stakeholders who participated in those events – you may or may not agree with their conclusions or you may have other suggestions that you would like to put forward, but whichever way you feel, we would like to hear from you.
3 Rural Community Workshops

3.1 The workshops were undertaken in all thirteen settlements mentioned in policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. Each workshop was attended by members of Ashford Borough Council’s planning policy team and by an Independent facilitator. This facilitator’s role was to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to air their views and the event was properly managed. Also in attendance were members of the community, invited by the Parish / Town Council, as well as representatives of the Parish / Town Council itself. The numbers of participants attending each workshop varied but in general, ranged from 15 – 25. The feedback from the participants of the workshops was on the whole, very positive.

3.2 However, the outcomes of the workshop can only reflect the feelings of those people who attended the workshop and you may not agree with some or all of their views. This section of the report will give you an opportunity to comment on any issue or view raised through the workshop process.

3.3 Given this, it is important to set the same context for discussion that was set at the start of each workshop.

The role of the workshops

3.4 The main role of the workshop was to get an initial understanding from a cross-section of the local community as to, broadly, which areas of the settlement could potentially be acceptable for future development.

3.5 Some participants at some of the workshops were of the opinion that there should not be any new residential sites allocated in their settlement. When this occurred, this view was noted and has been reflected in the workshop summaries. However, it was agreed by all participants that, for the purposes of the workshop, there was an assumption that some new development may have to located at their settlement, and therefore discussions would focus on where this development could be located, should it be required.

3.6 The discussion covered the whole area of the settlement and was not limited to just those sites put forward by landowners or developers promoting land for development in the rural area (as a result, a number of additional areas of land were put forward for consideration during the course of some of the workshops). In addition, you may be of the opinion that just part, and not all, of any promoted ‘site’ would be potentially suitable for development.

3.7 In most cases, sites that are large enough to potentially accommodate at least 5 dwellings were considered at the workshops as this is likely to be the threshold, above which the Council would potentially ‘allocate’ a site in the DPD. Sites below that threshold have traditionally been regarded as ‘minor’ development or ‘infilling’ and have not been specifically ‘allocated’ for development in a Local Plan.

Policy CS6 - Core Strategy DPD

3.8 Policy CS6 in the LDF Core Strategy identifies a number of different settlements that are considered suitable to have allocated development attributed to them in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD. These settlements are structured in a three-tier hierarchy. Policy CS6 of the Submitted Core Strategy can be seen at Appendix 2.
3.9 Tenterden is at the top of the hierarchy, as it clearly represents the largest and most established settlement in the Borough outside of Ashford. The second-tier contains Charing, Hamstreet, and Wye. Again these settlements are well established, identified in the existing Local Plan as the most sustainable rural settlements and play an important role as a local service centre in their part of the Borough. All the settlements in the top 2 tiers of the hierarchy are expected to accommodate some allocated residential development through the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.

3.10 The third tier is made up of 9 settlements and it is expected that the quantum of residential development identified in policy CS6 will be provided on sites within those 9 settlements. Therefore, this means that each settlement will not necessarily have an equal amount of development on allocated sites and it may potentially be the case that some of these settlements may not actually end up have allocated development attributed to them, if for example, if no suitable site is identified or more suitable sites can be found in another third-tier settlement.

3.11 The LDF Core Strategy has been examined over recent months by an independent planning inspector to determine its ‘soundness’. If he considers it to be sound, the Inspector is likely to make binding changes to the document which the Council are obliged to accept before the document can be adopted. Therefore, the current policy content of policy CS6 of the Core Strategy may alter. However, the Issues and Options discussed in this report are not dependent on the outcome of the Core Strategy Examination as they are primarily concerned with establishing principles for development in the rural areas and villages.

3.12 The notes from each of the village community workshops are set out in this section in the chronological order in which they were held. The relevant settlement plans showing the sites discussed at each of the workshops are attached to the end of each write up.

Sites submitted outside of the CS6 Settlements

3.13 It should be noted that some of the sites submitted to the Council by interested parties were not included in the discussion at the workshops. These were sites located such a significant distance from the respective main settlement that they could not be considered to relate to that settlement, i.e. clearly in the open countryside and therefore, not realistic potential site options for allocation in the DPD. In addition, a number of sites were submitted to the Council for consideration at locations outside of the settlements listed in policy CS6 of the Core Strategy. As allocating any of these sites would be inconsistent with the approach in policy CS6, these were also not regarded as realistic options for allocation in the DPD.

3.14 However, for completeness, a list of these sites is included in Appendix 3 of this Report.
4 Charing

Date: 12/11/2007

No. of Attendees: 17

No. of Breakout Groups: 2

General Themes Identified:

4.1 The majority view felt that it would be acceptable for new appropriately scaled development to take place at Charing providing:

- The development is in keeping with the local surroundings and adheres to the village design statement.
- The appropriate traffic calming and road improvements are made to support any new development.
- The setting of the AONB is taken into consideration.

Opportunities for Growth:

4.2 An extension to the new development of Charing Green was felt to be acceptable, as long as it didn’t extend past the A20/A252 roundabout and it didn’t extend too far westwards into the open countryside.

4.3 Small scale development outwards from the village centre north of the A20 was felt to be acceptable, as long as it abutted existing development and didn’t expand past the opposing terrace of Moat Park House.

4.4 Development of the Morrison Depot site, along with the adjacent pasture was identified as a possibility. Although dwellings would need to be in keeping and road improvements would need to be made.

4.5 Any development North of Pett Lane and Charing Hill was felt to be unacceptable. Many people considered this an undesirable direction of growth.

Views on Character:

4.6 The open area north of Pett Lane was felt to be particularly important in providing the rural setting of Charing when viewed from the east. This area should therefore be kept free of any new development.

4.7 It was felt that development that extends into the open countryside should be avoided, as this provides a rural setting to the village.

Types of Development:

4.8 Housing development should abut the existing development as not to create a segregated community.

4.9 Development scope for both, light industrial/warehouse and housing, within and surrounding the settlement was identified.

4.10 Light industrial or warehouse development should be on the main roads surrounding the village and preferably on existing brownfield sites.
4.11 There was a minority view that mixed-used development would be appropriate on some sites.

4.12 A new purpose-built village hall with associated playground facilities was suggested as a community need.

4.13 It was recognised that the school may require some enabling development to secure its future and enable it to grow and survive. There was a majority view felt that development for this purpose would be justified.

**Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:**

4.14 There was a concern over the capacity of Pluckley Road south of the A20 crossroads. A new road from the A20/A252 junction across the railway to Coppins corner was suggested-part enabled by development north of railway line.

4.15 There was a general concern about the speed of traffic through the village on the A20 and the ability of pedestrians to cross safely, especially if new development was south of the A20.

4.16 The possible location of a roundabout on the A20 and Old Ashford Road junction was identified as a need.

4.17 IT connections to assist employment opportunities are needed, broadband is not yet available in the village.

**General Views onSubmitted Sites:**

CHAR01:

It was established that this site had access problems and was situated away from the main settlement. The site was also small and would struggle to accommodate five dwellings or more. For the above reasons the site was discounted.

CHAR02:

4.18 The site was considered too remote from the village centre to be considered a viable housing development. The residents would have a long way to walk for goods and services and would feel detached from the village. A minority view felt that the site could be utilised for light industrial uses.

CHAR03:

This site was seen as a good potential housing site and a natural progression to the new development of Charing Green. It was felt that development here would not spoil the existing village and the site would be able to accommodate a large number of dwellings.

CHAR04:

4.19 This site was seen as having some potential for development, although access was seen as a significant limitation to the site. It was also a concern that the site was within the Conservation Area. There were mixed views on the type and form of development, with housing, commercial and workshops being possible considerations. It was identified that the site could be used in conjunction with the adjacent Morrison Depot site.

CHAR05:
4.20 This site was seen as being a potential site for housing development. Although it was identified that it was at some risk from flooding due to its proximity to the Alder beds. Traffic calming measures would also need to be put in place along the A20 if development was to take place here. It was also felt that only half of the site should be developed, the half closest to the settlement.

CHAR06:

4.21 This site was regarded as too remote from the village centre and situated within open countryside. It was felt that this site should not be considered further for any type of development allocation.

CHAR07:

4.22 This site was seen as a potential site for employment development, although concern was raised over the access to the area from Dog Kennel Lane.

CHAR08:

4.23 This site was regarded as a small residential development opportunity. Although access was accepted as being poor, it was recognised that a residential redevelopment could result in fewer vehicle movements (the site is currently used as a MOT testing station). There was some question as to whether 5 or more dwellings could be accommodated here.

CHAR09:

4.24 Although it was identified that CHAR03 and parts of CHAR10 could be suitable for residential development. The majority felt that development as far as CHAR09 would be inappropriate due to the impacts on the AONB and the open countryside. The proposed road link was seen as a natural boundary to the development.

CHAR10:

4.25 A small proportion of this site, if used in conjunction with CHAR03 could be suitable for development. A strong opinion stated that the entire site should not be utilised though, as this would be intrusive on the AONB and would spoil views of the open countryside.

CHAR11:

4.26 This site was not supported for development allocation as it was on the ‘wrong’ side of the A252, and was on top of the hill so pedestrian access to the village could be a problem. Although a small minority supported this site, the majority didn’t want the Charing settlement to extend into this area.

CHAR13:

4.27 Not a suitable site for allocation within the LDF as too remote from the village centre. However, it was identified that as other sites came forward, the potential of this site might be improved. A minority identified the site as suitable for light industrial use.

CHAR14:

4.28 Not a suitable site for allocation within the LDF as too remote from the village centre. However, it was identified that as other sites came forward, the potential of this site might be improved. A minority identified the site as suitable for light industrial use.

CHAR17:
4.29 Not a suitable site for allocation within the LDF as too remote from the village centre. However, when compared to sites CHAR13+14 this would be the preferred option. It was identified that as other sites came forward, the potential of this site might again increase. A minority identified the site as suitable for light industrial use.

CHAR18:

4.30 This site was regarded as too remote from the village centre and situated within open countryside. It was felt that this site should not be considered further for any type of development allocation.

CHAR19:

4.31 This site was regarded as too remote from the village centre and situated within open countryside. It was felt that this site should not be considered further for any type of development allocation.

CHAR20:

4.32 This site was regarded as too remote from the village centre and situated within open countryside. It was felt that this site should not be considered further for any type of development allocation.

CHAR21:

4.33 Although adjacent to CHAR07, it was felt that this site was less suitable for development. The site is on high ground and therefore visible from the road. A minority view felt that a small proportion of the site could be developed in conjunction with CHAR07 as a site for employment.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

CHAR22 (Identified by Group1 and 2):

4.34 This site was seen as having more potential than CHAR04 or could be used in conjunction with CHAR04. It was felt that the site was suitable for both housing and employment uses.

CHAR23 (Identified by Groups 1 and 2)

4.35 This site to be used in conjunction with possible development at CHAR03 and CHAR10.

CHAR24 (Identified by Group1):

4.36 This site was highlighted by one member as having potential for employment use.

CHAR25 (Identified by Group1):

4.37 This area was identified as a possible area for 'local need' housing.

CHAR26 (Identified by Group 2)

4.38 Site identified by a minority. Most thought the site was too small for housing and it currently acts as a barrier between existing housing and the main road.

CHAR27 (Identified by Group 2)
This site was identified, but discounted due to access difficulties and the view of the AONB being spoilt.

School was discussed as it may be possible to allocate some of the site for housing and use the revenue gained for refurbishing the school buildings.

This site could be used in conjunction with sites CHAR03 and CHAR10. However, would only be viable if a new road was built between Charing Heath Road and Pluckley Road junction and the CHAR03 site. This road would need to cross the railway line.

**Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop (See map):**

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

**Group1:**
- CHAR05 for housing
- CHAR03 for housing
- CHAR08 for housing
- CHAR07 for employment

**Group2:**
- CHAR03 for housing
- Part of CHAR10 for housing
- CHAR23
- CHAR07 for employment
- Part of CHAR05 for housing

**Conclusions:**

CHAR07 and parts of CHAR21 were identified as the best sites for commercial and employment development, whether in the form of light industrial units or small warehouse units.

CHAR 03, 05, 08 and parts of CHAR10 were identified as the best location for housing development.

CHAR04 with the adjacent Morison Depot site was identified as the site with the best potential for mixed use development.

Development to the south and west of the main settlement was favoured by the majority of attendees.
Question 1
The general feeling from the workshop is that development should be focused around the South and Western area of the village, to both continue the village's existing built form and protect the more visually sensitive areas to the North and East of the village. What is your stance on this issue?

Question 2
People questioned the capacity for the existing road network to accommodate further development. The speed and volume of traffic using this current network was also highlighted as a major concern. People felt that these issues should be addressed before any further development takes place in the village. What are your thoughts?

Question 3
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Charing workshop?
Charing Map

Sites submitted by people/organisations who have a vested interest in promoting land for development
Additional Sites identified at workshop

CHARING
Scale: 1:12500

This product includes mapping data from Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationary Office © Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence Number 100024427

ASHFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: ASHFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL HAS TAKEN NO FORMAL STANCE ON ANY SITE AT THIS STAGE.
5 Hothfield

Date: 20/11/2007

No. of Attendees: 13

No. of Breakout Groups: 1

General Themes Identified:

5.1 The particular circumstances of Hothfield’s inclusion in the core strategy policy CS6 were explained in particular. It was also explained that it was included in the CS as being worthy of further consideration – it was perfectly feasible that an outcome of the workshop could be there was no scope for further development.

5.2 There were two landowners present whose sites were submitted for consideration in Hothfield. Keith Nicholson explained to the group that they were present and asked the group if they were happy for them to remain in attendance – the group agreed and they remained in the meeting.

Opportunities for Growth:

5.3 Hothfield’s inclusion in the policy CS6 was discussed and in particular the fact that it was different to other villages included as it reflected the wishes of the local community for additional development in the village.

Views on Character:

5.4 Discussed in the context of the submitted sites and the other possible locations for development but significant landscape/countryside constraints exist to the north and south of the village.

Types of Development:

5.5 In terms of the overall scale of development – a substantial number (circa 50 – 70 homes) was mentioned.

5.6 There was a strong view from the people that attended the workshop, that the village needed larger executive style houses that would provide a boost to the village in terms of new people and families.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

5.7 There were significant transport/traffic issues at the A20 area – relating to access on and off the A20 and the existing parking areas – these could be referred to Kent County Council as an issue.

5.8 There was a strong feeling that whatever the scale of development that was proposed for Hothfield there was a need to retain the open gap between Ashford and the village.

5.9 No real support for employment uses within the village, although this was not discussed at length at the workshop.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

HOTH02:
There was then discussion about development in the western sector of the village adjacent to the pub – including (HOTH02) – there had been a previous refusal of permission on that site. There was some support for growth of the village in this sector – it could involve the loss of allotments and there was strong opposition to that. The logical access point into this area was from The Street opposite Tufton Road.

HOTH03:

Re the eastern sector adjacent to Coach Drive (HOTH03) - preventing any development here from being seen from the A20 was important. There was an important green entrance to the village from A20 that was worthy of retention. Potential access could be from the junction of School Road and Church Drive. Retention of the significant tree belt along Coach Drive was important and the possibility of a longer term expansion along Coach Drive as a further phase of development was discussed.

HOTH04:

The site of the former pub (HOTH04) was discussed at some length – it was explained that the planning application that was currently submitted on the site was recommended for refusal and there was a strong feeling from the group that this was the wrong decision and that the views of the parish council (who supported the application) had not been taken into account. The Parish had made their views known about the need for new housing in their village through the wish list process and this had been disregarded in the decision on the pub site. There was clear support from the group for the development of the pub site.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

In terms of the northern quadrant adjacent to the school - this adjoined the SSSI area – this seemed a constrained site – there were plans for the school to remain as community hub and this was seen a critical facility for the village.

There was discussion about the triangle of land bounded by the A20, School Road and road that links Coach drive and the A20 (Station Road). The possibility of having some selective development here was discussed providing a facility for Kent Wildlife Trust related to the Common, and improved car park possibly a playground facility with some limited residential development.

In terms of the north west sector of the village along West Street this was considered to be relatively exposed land and prominent in terms of its relationship to the existing built up part of the village. The southern side of West Street potentially linked to the western quadrant discussed above but clearly that depended upon the size of that development area.

In terms of the southern sector this fell within the conservation area and had a distinctive parkland landscape character which in the view of the group precluded it from consideration as a development site.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

HOTH03

Support expressed for development of HOTH04

Conclusions:
5.17 The group expressed a strong preference for the development of the land off Coach Drive (HOTH03) as being the preferred location for development. – this was in terms of the submitted site but also the broad location as being the most suitable direction for growth.

Hothfield Questions

Question 4

If there is to be further development at Hothfield should it be concentrated:

a) on the edge of the village at the eastern side of Coach Drive?

b) on the western edge of the village including the former pub site and adjoining land?

Question 5

Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Hothfield workshop?
6 Chilham

Date: 29/11/2007

No. of Attendees: 40

No. of Breakout Groups: 3

General Themes Identified:

6.1 The majority view felt that it would be acceptable for new appropriately scaled development to take place at Chilham providing:

- The development is in keeping with the local surroundings and adheres to the village design statement.
- It includes a large proportion of local needs and/or affordable housing
- The Bagham Junction (A28/A252) is modified accordingly and a safe crossing for pedestrians and cyclists is provided.

Opportunities for Growth:

6.2 'Rounding' development directly adjacent to the main settlement (Sites 3a and 3b) could be acceptable if in character with the surroundings.

6.3 Employment development in the form of light industrial or warehouse uses was identified as acceptable on sites CHIL01 and CHIL07/09.

6.4 Contradicting views over the growth of the settlement northwards towards the A252 were acknowledged. Some people felt this was the preferred direction for growth, other people felt that a 'greenbelt' between the edge of the settlement and the A252 should be retained.

6.5 A minority felt that development directly in front of the dwellings at Bagham Lane would be acceptable, but the green area between the two areas of housing would still need to be retained.

6.6 Development southwards from the main development would be inappropriate as it would spoil views over the open countryside and the area was at a significant risk from flooding.

Views on Character:

6.7 The area along Bagham Road was felt to be the main entrance into the settlement and any changes within the vicinity should reflect this status.

6.8 The retention of the protected trees forming 'the avenue' was felt to be a critical, as they provide an attractive entrance to the village and are part of the Conservation Area.

6.9 The distinct green buffer between the edge of the settlement and the cluster of dwellings at Bagham Lane should be retained as to retain prevent a feel of 'urbanisation'.

Types of Development:

6.10 Housing development should abut the existing development as not to create a segregated community.

6.11 Development scope for both, light industrial/warehouse and housing, within and surrounding the settlement was identified.
6.12 Light industrial or warehouse development should be on the main roads surrounding the village and preferably on existing brownfield sites.

6.13 It was felt that the community lacked adequate Doctors Surgery facilities and a new surgery with associated parking would benefit the community enormously.

6.14 There was a minority view that mixed-used development would be appropriate on some sites.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

6.15 Access to the railway station from the village centre needs to be improved for pedestrians and cyclists. Other areas of the village were also identified as needing improved pedestrian access.

6.16 Another car park needs to be provided near to the station as the current car park is at full capacity and cars resort to parking on the access road.

6.17 The junction of the A252 with Bagham Lane (a.k.a 'The Avenue') leading up to the village centre is an accident hotspot according to local residents and needs to be improved if development takes place along here.

6.18 Any development requiring access to A252 would require a 30mph speed limit imposed on the road.

6.19 The village centre of Chilham was seen as an ‘Island’ of development and should be retained thus.

6.20 Car-parking and traffic within the village centre was a problem and should not be exacerbated by further development.

6.21 A minority view felt that the settlement of Old Wives Lees could also benefit from development.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

CHIL01:

6.22 Development on this site was seen as appropriate as it was a ‘derelict’ site adjacent to the settlement. A strong consensus to light industrial/warehouse was felt; with a minority view feeling mixed use could be appropriate.

CHIL02A:

6.23 The majority view was not to develop on this site, as it provided a natural break and green space between the existing developments of the main settlement and Bagham Lane. It was seen as the main entrance and focal point into the settlement centre. Part of this site was also at risk of flooding.

CHIL02B:

6.24 Strong mixed views were felt about development at this site. One group felt it was appropriate, one group felt only part of the site was appropriate and one group felt development should definitely not occur here.

CHIL03A:
6.25 General consensus was felt that development could be appropriate here, as long as in keeping with the surroundings and not too over-powering. The picturesque entrance to the village would need to be complemented and the trees retained.

CHIL03B:

6.26 General consensus was that development could be appropriate here, as long as in keeping with the surroundings and not too over-powering. The picturesque entrance to the village would need to be complimented and the trees retained.

CHIL06:

6.27 Development was felt to be inappropriate here, as it was too far from the current settlement of Chilham and would create a segregated community. The access constraints and the potential of flooding at the site were also seen to be a problem.

CHIL07/09:

6.28 Development was felt to be appropriate at this site, as it was a brownfield site, situated on the main road. However, mixed views on the type of development were felt, with some people feeling it would be more suited to light industrial/warehouse and some people feeling that housing would be more appropriate. Some concerns were raised that residential development here would create a segregated community.

CHIL08:

6.29 General consensus was to not develop on this site, as it had poor access and would increase traffic and parking pressures in the village square. It was also felt that the shape and topography of the site would mean development would be difficult.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

CHIL09 (Identified by Group 1):

6.30 Was considered to be a potential development location and preferable to CHIL02b. If northward development were to take place, this site would provide a more logical and less linear development parcel.

CHIL10 (Identified by Group 2):

6.31 One resident suggested this site could be developed for large detached dwellings (maximum two) to in keep with the character and design of existing properties that surround the site and keep the rural feel of the village.

6.32 Large majority of group disagreed with this suggestion as is next to a well used public car park and traffic noises would impact on the ‘rural’ settings. (Group 1 also discounted this site).

CHIL11 (Identified by Group 2):

6.33 An additional site was added for consideration (Shrimpton Close, Old Wives Lees) as existing development has already taken place here and residents feel further development would create a more natural boundary to the Old Wives Lees village. Using this site for local needs housing was identified by some workshop attendees.
CHIL12 (Identified by Group 3):

6.34 A site at Mountain Street was identified as a possible candidate for development, as it had been mentioned at ‘some point’ in the past when discussing the growth of Chilham. Some people felt that the site would be ideal for a number of additional dwellings, and the location would be the correct direction of growth for the village. However, other group members identified that the owners of the site would not be interested in selling and that development here could increase traffic in the village centre.

CHIL13 (Identified by Group 1):

6.35 Site raised and rejected.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1:

Site west of CHIL02b and adj. A252. (Additional Site)

CHIL01

CHIL07/09

Group 2:

CHIL03a

CHIL03b

Group 3:

CHIL03a

CHIL03b

CHIL07/09

Conclusions:

6.36 Sites CHIL01 and CHIL07/09 were seen as being best suited to employment uses, either in the form of light industrial or warehouse units. The suitability of these sites is due to their proximity to the A28 and A252 and their spatial relationship to the main settlement.

6.37 Sites 3a and 3b were identified as the best sites for appropriately scaled housing development, although any development would need to compliment the surrounding environment.

6.38 Growth of the settlement north towards the A252 was raised as a further development consideration.

Chilham Questions
Question 6
If new housing is to be provided, should this be through a partial or greater eastwards expansion of the village (towards Bagham Lane) or northwards (towards the A252)?

Question 7
Is the former Sawmill site more suitable for residential or employment uses?

Question 8
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Chilham workshop?
7 Biddenden

Date: 06/12/2007
No. of Attendees: 21
No. of Breakout Groups: 2

General Themes Identified:

7.1 The majority felt that it was not appropriate for Biddenden to accept allocated development, principally because of the amount of recent developments and the negative impact on the settlement itself.

7.2 If development were to take place then it should be small scale development, providing it is in-keeping with the rural setting and adheres to the Village Design Statement and parish Plan.

7.3 Any new development should be kept close to existing road corridors.

7.4 Differing ideas were felt over the future growth of settlement. One group favoured development on the outskirts of the village, whilst the other group preferred development within or adjacent to the confines of the settlement.

Opportunities for Growth:

7.5 One group felt that development south of the village would be unacceptable, as there is currently no development there. However, the other group considered development to the south acceptable, even proposing sites not already submitted.

7.6 There was a consensus between the groups that BID23 and a section of BID18 would be appropriate for small-scale residential development.

7.7 Possibly a small scale office / light industrial units to be built south of BID06. But not on the site of BID06, as both groups wished to retain this as is.

7.8 The demolition of the existing village hall and the building of a new community hall on an existing site currently used by a HGV firm. It was proposed that the HGV firm could be re-located to the outskirts of the village.

7.9 General feelings were independent developments e.g. Nightingales are too far from the village, so any new development should lie within the confines of the village.

7.10 Suburbanisation was strongly opposed and that the rural character of the village should be retained.

Views on Character:

7.11 The majority agreed that any future development should be in-keeping with the character of the village.

7.12 There was strong emphasis on keeping the village feel and not creating suburbanisation by adding onto and merging existing housing estates (see parish plan).

7.13 There was strong agreement by both groups against back-land development occurring.

Types of Development:
Apart from residential development, light industrial / office development was also suggested to bring employment opportunities to the area and retain life within the village. Both groups preferred new light industrial / office units to be located away from the village centre.

The need for a new community centre was expressed by both groups.

Additional school building provision was discussed to ensure enough places are available for local children.

The need for local services in the village such as a doctors, dentist, surgery etc, possibly on the existing village hall site.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

A possible bypass was mentioned and apparently has been previously discussed around the location of BID15.

A minority also suggested recycling facilities to be made readily accessible within / near to housing estates.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

BID01/11a

It was felt that development on these sites would have a small visual impact on the village as they could be screened. However, there were concerns over access and backfilling occurring which was not favoured. Both sites are within walking distance to the village centre and school. The majority felt these areas could be suitable for development.

BID03/17

Both sites currently contain public footpaths and are surrounded by woodland. Some attendees noted that these sites were liable to being wet and boggy. It was felt that if development took place here it would create a backland style of development, which is not favoured and a large number of houses would be needed to make it a viable site. The consensus was not to develop in BID17 and a small minority agreed to some development within BID 03 as long as it was adjacent to the A274, rather than into the open countryside.

BID04, BID 18

Both sites cover a large area of green field / parkland. It was felt that these sites are of visual importance and add to the character of the village, despite the fact Pullen Barn Farm sits to the north of BID18. It was identified that BID04 should not be developed and after some debate, it was agreed a small section of BID18 lying south along the road could be suitable for development. This area would be within walking distance of the village and would not ruin the local character. However, if development did take place here there should be only one access road into the development, rather than ribbon development creating individual driveways as this would create problems for traffic along the A274.

BID06

Lies on the edge of the confines of the village. The majority feeling was that this site was too far from the confines to walk to the services of the settlement centre. There was a suggestion that the yard opposite would be preferable to build upon for employment uses e.g. offices / light industrial use, rather than destroy an un-developed piece of land.

BID07, BID16
7.24 A definite NO by everybody as BID16 is situated adjacent to the sewage works and BID07 is a large area that protrudes into the open countryside. The majority felt that developing BID07 would lead to an urban sprawl.

BID09, BID10

7.25 Both of these sites were deemed too far from the village centre and would create an isolated community. There was also concern that BID09 would be backfilling. The consensus was that both of these sites are NOT suitable for development.

BID11b

7.26 Development here was deemed to be acceptable by the group, providing road access was changed/improved as it is not suitable in its current state. Parking issues were also raised if this site were to be developed.

BID12

7.27 It was felt this site lies within the confines of the village and would fit within the existing infrastructure all ready in place. The feeling was the site wouldn’t spoil the aesthetics of the village. The majority favoured this site, although a small minority raised concerns of privacy and access to existing residents of Townland Close.

BID15

7.28 The old railway station was strongly favoured by one group as the best area for future development. The location was deemed good, as it is within walking distance of the village centre and any new development would not affect the aesthetics of the surrounding countryside. The land between BID15 and BID03 was also discussed, but the feeling was that this piece of land is visually attractive and in keeping with the rural character. Any development between BID15 and BID03 would have a negative impact and the consensus was no development should take place here.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

BID19a, 19b (Identified by Group 2)

7.29 Two areas of land lying south east of the village centre were suggested for potential development. The majority favoured BID19a with the minority favouring BID19b. It was felt both sites lie within the confines of the village as they are located behind the village hall and have good access.

BID20 (Identified by Group 2)

7.30 This proposed site lies next to BID19a but there was feeling that this site was too far from the village centre. A minority favoured this site for development.

BID21 (Identified by Group 2)

7.31 Along A262 the majority felt this site would be too far from the confines of the settlement for residential use, but could be ok for employment use. A small minority favoured housing for privacy.

BID22 (Identified by Group 2)
This proposed site lies on the opposite side of the road to BID09. The majority favoured housing here, rather than employment use. A minority thought development here would be visually intrusive.

BID23 (Identified by Group 1)

This site lies within the confines of the village along North street. As this site is currently in use for employment the majority agreed development of this site would be acceptable for a trade off. To move the current HGV firm to the outskirts of the village and replace it with either housing or there is demand / need for a new community centre. It was suggested by the majority to also demolish the existing village hall and replace with local needs housing. The proposed site for BID23 could then be used for a new community hall.

BID24 (Identified by Group 2)

This proposed site lies near the vineyard on the opposite side of the road to BID06. A minority felt that this area would be ok for a small number of houses.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1 favoured:

BID11b
BID12
BID23
A section of BID 18

Group 2 favoured:

BID15
BID19a
A section of BID18

Equal votes for BID22 & BID23

Conclusions:

Both groups were against backland development or any development that would create suburbanisation as it was felt this would destroy the rural feel and character of the village.

There was a consensus between the groups that BID23 and a section of BID18 would be appropriate for small-scale residential development.

BID23 is currently in commercial use and this site was favoured by both groups as the site for a new community centre. It was suggested to move the current HGV business to the edge of the village, possibly on a site opposite BID06.

One group favoured sites within the confines of the village and considered new development past BID04 to be too far from the confines of the village. This group did not want any development to take place in the southern part of the village.
7.39 The other group put forward possible sites in the south of the village and a minority favoured these sites for possible future development.

7.40 General feelings were independent developments e.g. Nightingales are too far from the village, so any new development should lie within the confines of the village. Suburbanisation was strongly opposed and that the rural character of the village should be retained.

Biddenden Questions

**Question 9**

Should the focus of future housing development be within Biddenden, so residents can easily walk to the services provided in the village; or located on the outskirts of the village, to limit the impact on existing residents?

**Question 10**

Should future development come forward on several smaller sites or one or two larger ones?

**Question 11**

Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Biddenden workshop?
8 Bethersden

Date: 13/12/2007

No. of Attendees: 28 (Average over 6 meetings)

No. of Breakout Groups: n/a, Village Consultative Group organised

General Themes Identified:

8.1 The Bethersden Consultative Group recognises that limited development in Bethersden is needed for the future sustainability of the settlement. However, all new developments should take the following factors into consideration:

- Any new development should adhere to the Parish Plan and must ensure that the character of the village is maintained.
- Good design should be of paramount importance, with individually designed buildings a preference (Lovelace Court was identified as a good example of where new development has blended in).
- New housing schemes should be of low density, with open space between buildings. A preference for housing spread over a number of sites rather than squeezed onto one site was identified.
- Protection of the existing village open spaces is seen as important, as the open areas are part of the character of the area and provide a buffer against dense ‘urban style’ developments.
- The provision of local needs housing in the village was of paramount importance in any new development.

8.2 In order of preference, new developments should benefit the community in the following ways:

- Maintain the primary school
- Provide green space
- Maintain/improve central parking
- Provide recreational space/facilities
- Provide a playground in the centre of the village
- Provide road safety benefits.

Opportunities for Growth:

8.3 Ribbon development along roads should be avoided. Small developments of approximately 5 houses spread over a number of sites are the preference.

8.4 Whether the settlement should grow within or outside of the village envelope was an issue that was raised by the Consultative Group. The potential development sites identified by the group covered a variety of areas.

Views on Character:

8.5 The parish of Bethersden is unique due to its shape and facilities. It has a defined heart created by the layout of the roads surrounding the village and the facilities within it. Any new development should complement and be unobtrusive to the existing settlement.

Types of Development:
8.6 Providing short and long-term local needs housing is of paramount importance when creating any new developments. These properties will need to be supplied below open market rates. The opportunity to provide local needs housing as part of a more general demand housing scheme was identified.

8.7 Businesses need to be encouraged to move into the area, so the village is more sustainable. Appropriate business/commercial premises need to be made available so that local employment can be provided.

8.8 Car parking in Bethersden was cited as a problem, appropriate parking sites need to be provided in the village centre.

8.9 Facilities for the young, sheltered accommodation, a village medical facility and community centre were all identified as possible needs for the community.

8.10 Improving and creating footpaths, pavements and cycle routes and increasing footpath lighting would also be welcomed.

8.11 The ideal development within the village would include primarily 2 and 3 bedroom houses.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

8.12 It was felt that for any new developments, a number of benefits could be gained for the wider community through 106 agreements. These include: improvements to the cross road junction at Mill Road and Pluckley Road, an extension of the footpath all the way along Mill Road and a usable green space/recreation area (not necessarily a play area).

8.13 The repositioning of the Children’s play area was identified as a possibility, moving the playground to the centre of the village would be preferred.

8.14 Any new developments should consider wildlife conservation

8.15 The Bethersden Consultative Group has not considered sites for businesses development.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

BETH01

8.16 This site was discounted in the first sift as being unsuitable for development

BETH02

8.17 This site is centrally located and currently provides a large open area in the central envelope of the village. Limitations to developing the site include the sloping aspect and the poor access from The Street or Forgefield. However, It was identified that part of the site could be developed, if the rest of the site was used for either community open space (recreation ground) or a car park for the village centre. However, a number of impacts were identified if this site were to be developed, these included: an increase in car numbers, an impact on the view of the church and new housing being a dominant feature.

BETH03/16

8.18 This site was discounted in the first sift as being unsuitable for development

BETH04
8.19 This large site was seen as having potential for development, due to its central location, its good access in and out of the village via the A28 and the owners previous interest of possibly developing the site. However, the road access directly onto the site is poor, the site line visibility could be a problem and development of the whole site could impact on existing housing. If this site were to be developed the quality of the green space in the village would need to be maintained and this could be achieved by; developing BETH04 only to the extent of the village hall grounds or by developing the site fully and protecting BETH02 as green space for the community in perpetuity.

BETH05

8.20 This site is too small to be allocated in the LDF on its own. However, this site was identified as a potential site for development if used in conjunction with BETH18, with the site forming the new access road into the development.

BETH06

8.21 Development here seems the logical extension for growth of the village and there is an option for future growth into BETH08. However, ribbon development on this site should be discouraged. The size of the site could accommodate a number of dwellings and would be a good site for Local Needs housing. It is felt that development here would be of low impact to the village. However, the site was felt to be some way from the village centre and the school and this could encourage car use. It was identified that a pavement from The Street to the site would need to be built, if any development was to take place here.

BETH07

8.22 Developing on this large site was felt to have a low impact on the village. The site has good access and avoids backland development. Additionally, the site was felt to be a good location for local needs housing, as well as having the potential for a future extension. However, the site was felt to be a long way from the village centre and school and this could encourage car use. It was identified that a pavement from The Street to the site would need to be built, if any development was to take place here.

BETH08

8.23 Although the topography of this site is level, a number of issues could impact on any potential development. These include poor access and the large pond contained within the site. This site was also felt to be too far from the village centre and would increase car use into the village centre.

BETH09

8.24 This site is centrally located and a possible candidate for development. However, if any development is to take place here modifications in the form of a roundabout would need to take place on the A28. The preference would be to build away from the A28, with access to the site being off of Forge Hill. If any development was to take place here, the impact on the existing housing and flooding issues would need to be taken into consideration.

BETH10

8.25 This site currently provides valuable local employment, so would not be a preferred site for development. The site is also small and would not be relevant for entry into the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.

BETH14/17
Although this site is located outside of the village envelope, it is close to a number of local amenities and could potentially be used to provide a parking drop-off point to the primary school or a small-scale housing development, possibly Local Needs. There were however, concerns that access to the site could be a problem, as the site is bordered on two sides by narrow country lanes and inadvertently could increase traffic outside of the school. Additionally, it was identified that the site was located near to a mobile phone mast and the sewerage works. However, it was identified that development on this site could possibly improve the look of the site.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note a number of additional sites were identified by the Consultative Group, but only the additional sites ranked in the top 10 have been shown below.)

BETH18:

This site was seen as a good site for development if BETH05 was used as an access point. This site is a logical extension to the existing, recent large development and is close to the local school. It was felt that by developing here, there could possibly be some trade-off for an improvement to the footpath. In addition, disruption would be minimal due to the site position and existing utilities, i.e. gas, water, etc.

BETH19:

This site has development potential, as it would have a low impact on the existing settlement. The site has good access and is centrally located for local amenities. A possibility of trading off some land for the school was identified, especially if used in conjunction with neighbouring fields. However, the field is low lying and is vulnerable to water logging.

BETH20:

Although this large site is located close to the village centre, the site also protrudes into the open countryside. A concern was raised that if development took place here, there would be a natural progression to develop neighbouring sites.

BETH21:

This site is currently used as a recreation ground. However the possibility of utilising this site for housing and relocating the recreation ground to site BETH22 was discussed. This site is centrally located, with good access, and the whole or part of the site has potential for development. However, the final conclusion from the Bethersden Consultative Group was that this site should not be developed.

BETH22:

This site could be developed for bungalows as it is close to the village centre. However, concerns were raised over the negative impact on existing housing, the narrow access and the potential flooding of the site. Development here would also be back filling which isn’t ideal, but could be acceptable if a buffer zone was created around the development. Any development would need to improve the footpath which runs through the site. The idea of building on the recreation ground site and relocating the recreation ground to this site was identified.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(sites in order of preference)

BETH06
Conclusions:

8.32 The village of Bethersden understands that appropriate development is needed to ensure the future sustainability of the settlement. The community of the village would like to work with Ashford Borough Council to ensure that any proposed development is appropriate, in keeping with the surroundings and to ensure that the interests of the residents are best served.

8.33 Bethersden understands that suitable sites identified in this workshop process, would still need to become available from the landowner.

8.34 Bethersden understands that development could be used to improve the current facilities offered to the residents, for example through trade-offs and section 106 agreements. These improvements could be in the form of increased public open space, recreation facilities and improved footpaths etc.

8.35 The provision of local needs housing in the village is also of paramount importance. This could be provided as a solely local needs scheme or as part of a wider development. A requirement of approximately 20 local needs units is needed for the village (Bethersden Parish Plan, 2002), although a further study is needed to verify this figure.

Bethersden Questions

Question 12
The group felt that, high density development, cramming a lot of houses on a site, would be out of character with the built form of Bethersden and instead preferred a less dense style of development? Which approach do you advocate?

Question 13
Should future development come forward on several smaller sites or one or two larger ones?

Question 14
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Bethersden workshop?
9 Aldington

Date: 18/12/2007

No. of Attendees: 14

No. of Breakout Groups: 2

General Themes Identified:

9.1 It was agreed that there should be additional development in Aldington, as long as the following factors were taken into consideration:

9.2 Traffic should not increase in and around the village. The infrastructure and road network within the settlement are already strained; appropriate traffic calming and road improvements would be needed to support any new development.

9.3 Any new development needs to be in keeping with the surrounding area, and individual, well designed homes would be a preference. It was noted that a ‘Park Farm’ style developments would not be welcomed.

9.4 A high percentage of affordable and local needs housing would need to be provided in any new development. Aldington’s population is aging, as younger people have to move out of the area where housing is cheaper.

Opportunities for Growth:

9.5 Any new development should take place to the north of the settlement. Developing to the south would damage the attractive setting that the area provides to the village and would obstruct views of the open countryside.

9.6 The general consensus disapproved of sites developed away from the main settlement as this tended to increase car use to the village and creates a segregated community. Although, it was noted that the prison site was an exception to the rule, all future development should be within or adjoining the settlement.

Views on Character:

9.7 Important views to the south and southeast over the Romney Marsh and north towards the Downs were noted as being particularly important and provided the landscape setting for the settlement.

9.8 The access to the settlement from Frith Road, was seen as an attractive village entrance and approach, it provides the setting to the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings.

9.9 The open green spaces within the centre of the village are seen as important and provide a distinct feel and identity to the village of Aldington.

Types of Development:

9.10 The workshop identified that the area lacked job opportunities. Two ways were identified to help solve this problem; provide jobs in the area by means of new economic development or improve public transport and road links into surrounding towns.
9.11 An idea of a combined sports and social club was brought forward (there used to be a social club at the prison that was used by the community). There was uncertainty about how this would be provided but it would provide sports facilities and a licensed social venue for the community and surrounding area.

9.12 There is currently no doctor’s surgery within the village, with the nearest surgeries located in Hamstreet or Sellinge. This makes it very difficult for the elderly population to access medical services. A new doctors surgery would be welcomed for the settlement.

9.13 The school lacks appropriate parking facilities and many people are forced to park on the road. A new car park would be welcomed and it was felt this could be provided as part of another development scheme by way of a Section 106 Agreement.

9.14 There is also a view that traffic calming measures are needed in certain areas of the village. Traffic at certain times of the day is identified as a particular problem outside of the primary school.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

9.15 There is currently a lack of walkways, pavements and footpaths in and around the village which encourages people to use cars on already narrow and crowded roads. Any new development should provide appropriate network links for pedestrians.

9.16 Improvements to bus services are needed. Public services to and from the village are very poor, with the last bus at 4pm.

9.17 Access roads from A20 are liable to flooding and heavy snowfall, this can cause associated access problems to parts of the village.

9.18 It was identified by some group members that parts of the village are liable to subsidence.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

ALD01a, ALD07a, ALD07b and ALD15:

9.19 All of these sites were discounted. The access to these sites is off Frith Road, which is already narrow and has two blind corners; there is no room to widen the road at this point. Not only are the sites located within a Special Landscape Area, development here could affect the adjacent Conservation Area and listed buildings. Additionally it is felt that development on sites ALD01a and ALD07b would ruin the look and feel of the farmstead and there has been a history of refused applications on site ALD15.

ALD01b:

9.20 The main access point to this site is opposite the Village Shop and development here should be avoided at all costs; there is already severe traffic pressure. Development could also damage the setting of the village and may introduce ‘skyline’ eyesores

ALD01c:

9.21 This site was identified as a possible infill site as it is close to the heart of the village. However, the site is small and only one or two houses were felt to be acceptable. This form of development could come forward in a planning application.

ALD02:
9.22 This site was considered as a potential new housing site, as the neighbouring site (Celak Close) had already been developed. It was noted that this site was situated on a prominent crest, so appropriate screening would be needed to protect views, if development was to take place here.

ALD05:

9.23 This site is currently a vehicle repair business, and the majority of the group felt that it should remain in employment use if developed. It was felt to be too far away from the main settlement to be used for housing. The access to the site is very poor, so any development should not increase pressure on the already narrow roads.

ALD06/14:

9.24 There were distinctly different views from the two groups on this site. One group felt that NO development should take place here, as the site provides a green break between the current ribbon of development and provides views of the SLA. The other group felt that this site had some development potential, and possibly housing would be an improvement on the existing abattoir. A concern was raised over the loss of the butchers to the community, it was felt that if any new development were to take place it should incorporate a replacement shop. The abattoir being relocated away from this site was mentioned, but not discussed at length.

ALD07c:

9.25 This site was discounted due to the poor access onto the site. The main access point would have to be in front of the village shop, although it was noted that access could be via ALD01c. Additionally, this site was felt to provide the setting of the village and development southwards should be discouraged. The sloping topography of the site would make it difficult to develop.

ALD08:

9.26 This site was discounted for housing as it was too far from the confines of the village. There was possibly scope for one or two commercial units, but the site has poor access and due to its prominent position would be visible from the north.

ALD09:

9.27 The majority of people supported development on this site for housing, with a minority feeling that it could be used for a mixed-use development. It was felt to be a better location than ALD02, as the site isn’t in such a high prominent location and the access road is wider.

9.28 The idea of building a road through the site was also identified to help relieve traffic in front of the school. It was felt that this could be funded by a Section 106 agreement from the developer, if the rest of the site was used for housing. Closing the road in front of the school or having some sort of restraint on access if a new road was built was also mentioned, but not discussed at length. If there was to be a community hall/sports hall as mentioned above it is most logically located with the school, with a new car park serving both facilities.

ALD10:

9.29 This is a former employment site, but is currently vacant. The two groups had differing views on the future development of this site. One group preferred redevelopment for small scale business or office units. Whilst the other group felt that a small scale housing development would be better, it would provide less traffic on already narrow and limiting roads (e.g. Dickens Bourne).

ALD11:
9.30 This site was discounted as it is too far from the confines of the village. Developing here would increase pressures on already narrow roads. The idea of reopening the bridleway adjacent to ALD11 was mentioned. However, many of the group felt that there were much better sites to develop, within or adjacent the confines of the main settlement.

ALD12:

9.31 Site not discussed at workshop.

**Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:**

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

ALD17 (site identified by Groups 1 and 2):

9.32 Small scale housing development in the corner of this disused quarry was felt appropriate for the village and surrounding area.

ALD18 (site identified by Group 2):

9.33 It was felt that if development was to take place at ALD09, developing this site would be a natural progression in the future. The growth of the settlement in this direction was favoured.

**Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:**

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

**Group1:**

ALD02
ALD09
ALD17

**Group2:**

ALD02
ALD09

**Conclusions:**

9.34 It was identified by the workshop that the preferred direction of future growth was northwards.

9.35 Sites ALD02 and ALD09 were identified as the favoured sites for development. However, other sites with potential were also identified, specifically brownfield sites in the area.

9.36 The limitations of the road network and pedestrian routes within and surrounding the settlement were identified as a key consideration for any future development.

9.37 The settlement was identified as being in a prime setting and any new development should not damage or intrude on the landscape.

9.38 The good design of any future developments was seen as paramount.
Aldington Questions

**Question 15**
Do you agree that any new development at Aldington should be located on the northern side of the village?

**Question 16**
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Aldington workshop?
10 Tenterden

Date: 23/01/2008

No. of Attendees: Approximately 30

No. of Breakout Groups: 3

General Themes Identified:

10.1 Tenterden is an attractive, well kept, safe and healthy market town. It has a wide range of shops, restaurants and has close links to the countryside directly from the centre of the town. It incorporates good quality schools and recreation facilities, which are well used by the towns’ residents. Given these positive assets, it is vitally important that any new development at Tenterden should respect and enhance its high quality character, including its scale, proportion and architecture. New development should not disturb the current residents, but help to enhance and preserve the community.

Opportunities for Growth:

10.2 Generally, it was felt that Tenterden should grow in a ‘lateral’, rather than a linear way. The preference was not to carry on extending development along the A28 corridor, or out to the east along the Appledore or Woodchurch Roads. The preferred approach was to grow outwards from the centre.

10.3 It was identified by all groups that Tenterden had a clear settlement boundary and development outside of this ‘built confines’ was generally not favoured, especially if it was to spread and negatively impact on the open countryside. All groups saw the railway line as a clear boundary of the town.

10.4 A number of workshop attendees felt that any new development should be compact in character and people should be able to walk to the town centre from any new development.

Views on Character:

10.5 The approach to Tenterden from Ashford was seen as an significant gateway from open countryside to a more urban environment. It was considered that this area provides important views for the residents of Tenterden.

10.6 The historic character of the High Street in the Conservation Area should be protected and enhanced. The independent retailers which make-up a large proportion of the High Street were specifically identified as giving character to the High Street. Tenterden’s existing primary shopping frontage policy was also considered a useful tool in promoting appropriate shop frontages in the High Street.

10.7 Enhancing and maintaining views to the Church was also seen as critical to preserving the character of Tenterden.

10.8 Some of the open spaces in and around Tenterden were identified as being important to the characteristic of the town. The AONB was specifically highlighted – the area to the west of the town had a clear edge created by the railway line and the AONB beyond. This was an valuable area in terms of the landscape setting of the town but also had the potential form more managed access. One group suggested the potential of a country park. The AONB boundary is equally fundamental for the southern side of the town and the approach along Small Hythe Road.

Types of Development:
A need for more office and industrial space was identified and this was felt necessary to help attract and retain young people within the town.

It was felt that there was no pressing need to identify new land for retail development in the Tenterden and Rural sites DPD as this was market led and new retail premises could be raised through planning applications. However, the retention and possible review of the primary shopping frontage was considered important to promote A1 shops in the high street. There was a strong concern about the proliferation of charity shops in the town and about shops being converted to residential uses. The frontage policy was considered a good vehicle to promote appropriate shop uses on the high street. However, the usefulness and application of the shop frontage policy from the local plan was raised as an issue by a minority.

The need for more public open space was identified and was considered to play an important role in delivering sustainable communities. Feeling was mixed as to whether it was better to pool contributions towards a significant piece of open space rather than have smaller, piecemeal areas on development sites. However, it was unanimous that all open space should be of high quality and easily accessible to the public. Recreation grounds providing sport facilities are a particular need for the community.

The continuation of the Doctors Surgery within Tenterden was considered essential by the group. The surgery needs to expand, as it is currently working beyond its capacity and any increase in population will further aggravate this problem. This was highlighted as a critical issue by a representative from the surgery. It was further stated that expansion on its existing site was not favoured, as land ownership issues with the adjacent PCT site were considered to be a substantial barrier. A new site would be a preference, incorporating a modern state of the art building. Working in partnership with other organisations to share these facilities was also supported. The site next to the leisure centre was cited as a possible new location.

A representative from the Day Care centre raised similar views to that of the surgery. They are already at full capacity and would not be able to fulfill its current function in the future unless they expand. Again expansion on its current site was not considered possible, given the size of development footprint on the existing site. They again favoured a new site, with a new facility and the possibility of partnership working with other organisations was identified as acceptable.

Delivering Affordable and Local Needs housings was considered an important element to delivering a balanced community within Tenterden. The underlying view was that there was a need for greater provision for local needs and affordable housing, especially for young people. Additionally, key worker living provision, particularly for the workers of West View Hospital, was highlighted as being a specific need to address.

There is a shortage of entertainment for young people in the town. This issue could be addressed by providing one or all of the following suggestions: a multi-use games area, a skate park and possible a small cinema, like the Kino Cinema in Hawkhurst.

Parking and Public Transport:

Parking was confirmed as being a key local issue for Tenterden, a greater number of long-stay spaces for shoppers, visitors and people working in Tenterden are needed, as well as coach parking spaces for tourists. The favoured solution to the problem was additional public car parking in a central location to the main part of the town centre. The possibility of a park and ride facility was also identified. A minority promoted the idea of a multi-storey carpark for the town, although the general feeling of participants was that this would be out of character for Tenterden. Additional cycle parking facilities would also be welcomed.
10.17 Improvements to public transport was also considered a possible solution to Tenterden’s parking problems. In addition, all participants felt that public transport needed to be improved in general to help aid the congestion along the A28. Cycling routes and cycle storage would also be beneficial, a purpose built route between St Michaels and Tenterden was cited as a specific want.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

10.18 A couple of wooded areas on the eastern side of St Michaels were raised as being potentially vulnerable to development pressures, officers have since researched their status and they are partly protected by TPO’s.

10.19 There was a discussion around the rather unusual SLA boundary to the north of the town (near sites TENT01 and TENT15), with the A28 corridor being excluded from the SLA but with SLA designation on either side. It is agreed that this situation is rather hard to understand and will be looked into further.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

TENT01:

10.20 It was felt that this site was not well related to the town and development here would continue the linear development theme which was not supported.

TENT02, 06, 09:

10.21 These sites were all regarded as examples of linear development and thus should not be taken forward. Development here would also impact on the important transition between the urban and rural area, which is seen an important character feature of Tenterden and St Michaels, and a key gateway into the town centre.

TENT03, 07, 08:

10.22 Mixed views were felt about development in this area. The general feeling from Group 2 & 3 when this area was discussed was against development in this broad area. Respondents felt it is not well screened and development would be visually intrusive on the character of the area. Access was also raised as an issue, Station Road was considered to be at full capacity and finding a suitable access point to the sites was questionable. However the ranking exercise of Group 2 didn’t entirely reflect the views of the discussion. Tent 07 was ranked quite highly by Group 2 as a possible development area.

10.23 In addition when discussing TENT07, Group 1, in particular strongly supported development in this area, putting the site forward as one of their preferred options. They acknowledged that for development to take place here, an alternative means of access would be required, going through the estate roads and Station Road would not be acceptable. They suggested that a realistic option would be to provide access via the cemetery to the west onto Cranbrook Road and that this would enable the site to come forward for residential use.

TENT04:

10.24 All attendees agreed that this site was not suitable for housing development. However, a number of attendees felt that industrial type employment uses could be located here. This would then be an extension to the existing Leigh Green Employment site (see also additional sites).

TENT05:
10.25 This area was considered an important access point to the green area on the outskirts of Tenterden, it is particularly well used by walkers and dog walkers and hence development here would be inappropriate.

TENT10:

10.26 Differing views were identified from the break-out groups regarding the development potential of this site. One group felt that although there were potential access problems to the site (due to its location on a bend), the site had some development potential. However, no consensus on the form or type of development was reached. Another of the groups felt that this site would be an ideal location for keyworker housing, especially to serve the workers of West View Hospital. The final group felt that due to the concerns over access and the AONB status, this site was not suitable for any form of development.

TENT11:

10.27 The majority felt that the western boundary of Tenterden was defined by the railway line and the disused railway line to the north. The area outside of these confines is considered to be very important landscape wise and of high visual quality, hence the AONB designation. Due to these reasons TENT11 was ruled out for any further consideration.

TENT12:

10.28 All groups identified this site as a good location for future development because the site is in a less visually intrusive location than other areas and is located close to the Town Centre. It was also felt that development here could provide a more definitive built edge to this part of the town, without impacting unduly on its character or views.

10.29 Considering this site comprehensively and on its own merits, it satisfied the criteria for compact development linked to the High St etc. It could potentially be linked to the expansion of the Waitrose car park or the comprehensive redevelopment of the area at the entrance to the Waitrose car park that also fronted onto the High Street.

10.30 A number of groups discussed this site as part of a wider Masterplan area (see additional sites). This scheme would see a wider area developed for a range of uses, for example, housing, employment, a road, parking, surgery etc.

TENT13:

10.31 Mixed views were felt on the development potential of this site. A number of people felt that this site would be acceptable for development whether in the form of an extension to an existing housing area or in the form of a new link road from Appledore Road into the recreation centre area and recreation ground. This area would appear to be a relatively easy site to develop and pedestrian / cycle links to the centre could be provided. However, some people felt that this area was too removed from the town and outside the eastern boundary of the built-up area and therefore would not be appropriate to develop.

TENT14:

10.32 This site is a small brownfield site that does have a small amount of development potential. However, it was identified by a number of attendees that the development of this site could come though a planning application, rather than being a specific site allocation in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD. The majority of the group identified that if development was to take place here it should be in the form of employment uses, as the site was too far removed from the town to be favoured for housing development, and was currently a small employment site.

TENT15:
This site was identified as being too far out of the town for any substantial development or to be truly favoured. However, a minority did feel that the site could be used for some employment development. However the site is located on a bend, so access constraints would need to be overcome first.

TENT16,17:

The majority regarded both of these sites as too remote from the town to be considered appropriate for new development. There is also no access at present to the site and any development here would encroach into the open countryside. A number of people felt that this area could only be considered as part of a whole area to the south of the town and this would help secure its long term protection.

TENT18:

Differing views were felt about the potential of this site. Some people favoured this area as it is considered to be in close proximity to Tenterden’s centre and is also well screened from the outside. It was noted that any development in this location would need to be well landscaped and should not cover the whole of TENT18 but only part of it. It would need to be complimented with open space to soften its impact. However, problems with access, and the differing heights of the land were cited as additional issues that would need to be overcome. Conversely, a minority of people felt that this area was an important green area which breaks the urban fabric of Tenterden and should not come forward as a development site. Fears were that this would represent backland development and it would be outside of the built confines.

TENT19:

Mixed views were felt about this site. However, the majority of the attendees did identify that the sites current guise as a football pitch was an important community facility and should be retained, or at least provided elsewhere if development was to take place here. It was identified that the sports facilities could be developed further to benefit Homewood School and the wider community. Nonetheless, there was concern that development in this location would have an impact upon the character of Appledore Road and the potential expansion in this direction was not desirable.

TENT20:

There was some support for this site but only if the development was restricted to the northern end of the site and the frontage and listed building were protected. The majority wished to retain the open space as this provided a strategic open gap, which softened the urban fabric.

TENT21:

Tenterden Vineyard, not discussed at workshop as beyond the confines of the main settlement.

TENT22: Pickhill Business Park and adjacent land

Submitted post workshop

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

TENT23 (Identified by Group 2):
The area south of TENT20 was identified on the workshop map as a preferred site for development. However, no further information on the merits of the site were documented.

TENT24,25 (Identified by Group 1):

These two sites would be used in conjunction with TENT12 and in broad terms, this area was seen as being an area close to the town centre and its facilities, which could provide a more definitive built edge to this side of the town without impacting unduly on its character or views. Part of this area was also identified as being a good location for a long-term car and coach park.

TENT26 (Identified by Group 3):

This was put forward by the group. Generally this area was considered to be in a location which would have low visual impact and could ‘round off’ the built fabric and form in that location.

TENT27 (Identified by Group 3):

This was also put forward by group 3 and some favoured this site given its locality to the town centre and minimal visual impact.

TENT28 (Identified by Group 2):

This site was proposed as a possible extension to the existing Leigh Green employment site, and was favoured for development over site TENT04. This site was not discussed at length.

TENT29 (Identified by Group 1 and 2):

A number of attendees felt that in its current state Highbury Hall was of poor quality and had little aesthetic value. It was there identified as a possible location for a conversion to new workshops in the heart of the town and/or a community facility.

A Proposed Master Plan (Identified by Group 3):

This was a relatively large area put forward by a number of participants. The promoters felt that comprehensively ‘masterplanning’ this area of Tenterden would be a good option as it would; provide a road (the context relating to the type of road, whether it be a relief road or a minor road was not agreed), open up potential development footprints in the immediate area, round off Tenterden with development which would be in keeping with its character and would provide a large amount of development in close proximity to the town.

It was accepted that this approach may well need to be phased, with a road alignment being ‘safeguarded’ in advance. It was clear that participants did not want this whole area comprehensively delivered within the plan period, if the road could not come forward as a result of the numbers stipulated under CS6. If the numbers in CS6 couldn’t deliver this option through planning contributions, they did not want more development in Tenterden to justify it.

It was also accepted that this area would encompass TENT20, especially with regards of access. However, any development of TENT20 would need to be small scale and less dense, have regard to protecting and enhancing Hale Place and also leave a substantial amount of TENT20 as a strategic green gap.

Even though a great deal of debate was had over the merits of this site, the overall opinion was that other areas of Tenterden, principally TENT18 and 13 should come forward before this option, in any event. It should also be noted that there was a minority of group 3 who felt that the principle of the master plan was unacceptable and would harm the character of Tenterden.
Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1:
- TENT07
- TENT25
- TENT24

Group 2:
- TENT18
- TENT07
- TENT20 (Northern part of site)

Group 3:
- TENT18
- TENT13
- TENT12

Conclusions:

10.50 A number of key issues were identified at the Tenterden and Rural Sites workshop, which were felt by all attendees to being of importance to any development plan for Tenterden. These included:

- The continued protection of the High Street and the countryside, specifically the AONB and SLA. Tenterden was seen as having close links to the countryside, and the views and access should be retained.
- All groups identified that any development should be phased and compact to lessen the look of ‘mass’ created and to help preserve Tenterden’s character. Phased development would also have less impact on the current residents of the town.
- The issue of parking in the town centre was a specific need that needs to be addressed in the future plan.
- The potential for merging of community facilities into one, more centrally located facility with ample parking, was a strong need expressed throughout the workshop. The need for inter-connectibility of public services would benefit the community as a whole and could make better use of space within the town.
- Specific development needs required within the town include affordable and local needs housing, better facilities for young people and small office/workshop units.

Tenterden Questions
Question 17
One group felt very strongly that development should not focus around the Appledore road area of the Town, primarily due to traffic related issues. However two groups both highlighted this area as a favoured location for development, notably sites Tent 18, 19 and 13 were supported. What is your view on this matter?

Question 18
One group felt very strongly against development in the Tent 07 area, primarily due to the impact on the visual setting of the area and urban sprawl into the countryside. However 2 groups both supported this location for development. What is your view?

Question 19
The groups generally agreed that development should be first focused within Tenterden to provide housing near or close to Tenterden’s existing services and also to lessen the impact of development into the countryside. Do you agree?

Question 20
The workshop felt that phasing the development intended at Tenterden was very important, both to ensure that it can be successfully integrated with the existing residents, and to mitigate against adverse impacts on Tenterden’s character. What is your viewpoint?

Question 21
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Tenterden workshop?
11 High Halden

Date: 31/01/2008
No. of Attendees: 49
No. of Breakout Groups: 4

General Themes Identified:

11.1 Generally, participants at the workshop felt that High Halden shouldn’t have allocated growth attributed to it. If it were to accommodate growth it should be of a small scale and reflect the Village’s character. Many residents felt that the existing infrastructure and local services within the village were already at capacity. For example, the village had recently lost its shop, there were few employment opportunities, and even though High Halden Primary School had just had an extension, it was already at capacity. It was also identified that in recent years around 50 new homes had been built with no obvious benefits for the village. Additionally, it was identified that the village centre had issues with car parking, as a number of streets were often full of parked cars, making access through the village very difficult.

11.2 All residents encouraged development that would benefit the community as a whole.

Opportunities for Growth:

11.3 The western side of the settlement has better access than the east end of the village and was perceived as the best general direction for any new housing development and community facilities such as a doctors and dentist surgery.

11.4 There was a general consensus against encouraging ribbon and linear development in High Halden.

11.5 The southern side of the settlement has poor access onto the A28 and is a bit of an accident hotspot, therefore was noted as poor area for future development. Additionally, the area to the south, within the settlement curtilage has poor parking facilities and this problem should not be exacerbated by additional dwellings.

11.6 The eastern side of the settlement has narrow rural lanes and has poor access out onto the A28. Development in this area of the village should be discouraged.

Views on Character:

11.7 Views of the village from Cripple Hill (from the A road to the north of the village) should be preserved. This northern end of the village stretches into open countryside, which is an amenity well used by local people, specifically the footpaths.

11.8 An important gap in the village street scene was mentioned between Summerhill Cottage and Bourne House along the south of the A28.

Types of Development:

11.9 All groups identified that the recent closure of the village shop was a tragic loss for the village, as it was a real focal point for the community. All participants felt very strongly that a new shop needs to be located within the village, preferably at the centre of the village to serve the residents.
11.10 It was highlighted at the workshop that the existing village hall is too small and has no car parking facilities. A new hall that was centrally located with parking facilities would be hugely beneficial to the residents of High Halden. Combining the rebuilding of the village hall, with the new shop was cited as possibility.

11.11 The majority of participants felt that High Halden needed far more provision of both Affordable and Local Needs housing, to allow the village to retain the population that grew up there. It was also identified that more affordable/sheltered housing bungalows are needed for the elderly residents of the village.

11.12 One group identified that an all weather surface for recreation could benefit the wider community.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

11.13 A number of people suggested the addition of a bypass to the outskirts of the village, to solve the problem of traffic traveling through the village, especially lorries. Conversely some people felt a bypass would be detrimental to High Halden and would result in less people visiting the village to support the facilities it offered.

11.14 A suggestion was made that the current speed limit be extended further out of the village, not just when you enter the village. It was suggested that a 40mph zone begin at the junction of A2009 Biddenden Road with the Ashford bound A28 to encourage motorists to slow down earlier. Other speed limit measures were mentioned including a speed camera and traffic islands.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

HIGH01,03:

11.15 This general area was not considered within High Halden and is too remote to be considered acceptable. It was felt that development here would erode the visually important gap between the settlements of Durrant Green, London Beach and High Halden and would also damage the area that represents a key gateway into the settlement.

HIGH05:

11.16 This site is a vacant office building with parking, which has been unoccupied for sometime. The majority of people felt that this site would be suitable for development, but should remain in employment use. Conversely, one group felt that this site would make a better housing site as it is located within the confines of the village.

HIGH06,08:

11.17 This site is the old KCC depot site, which has been vacant for sometime. All participants felt that this area would be suitable for development, as it a brownfield site reasonably central in the village and with good access onto the A28. The general consensus was that this area would be better used for employment purposes, in the form of small business units and a new village shop. However, residential development would be acceptable in some instances and would be preferred over a residential training centre which is currently proposed. One group preferred this site solely for housing, suggesting 20 homes, with recreational facilities surrounding the site to create a buffer to the countryside.

11.18 (It can be noted that that the planning application for a residential training facility for construction skill workers on this site was dismissed at appeal, 12th February 2008).

HIGH09:
11.19 The majority of people opposed this site for development due to its access issues, being outside of the village confines and the damage to the open countryside that would be caused. This area is of high landscape and visual quality and is well used by leisure and dog walkers. Also, the Bewl Pipeline runs through the site. However, a minority considered a parcel of land to the south-east of the site suitable for development as this would create a more natural curved boundary to the existing residential estate of Little Robhurst.

HIGH10:

11.20 A mixed response was received about the development of this site. A number of people discounted this site for development, because it has poor access, it is away from the main settlement and provides important views out to the west for existing properties. However, some residents supported limited development on part of the site, and suggested the provision of a children’s play area as part of the proposal. However, there were concerns whether the existing sewer system could cope with additional development and the provision of a new independent sewage pipeline would possibly be needed.

HIGH12:

11.21 The majority of residents were against any development in this part of the village. It was considered to be a good local amenity in terms of green space and has a network of well-used footpaths. It is also not within the villages’ natural boundary. However, a small minority felt that this site would be suitable for housing development as it had an existing access off of Little Robhurst.

HIGH17:

11.22 Although, a small minority suggested that this site was not the worst large scale development option put forward and one group even identified it as a favoured option. The over riding impression gained from the workshop was that this site was not suitable for development. It was felt existing infrastructure was already at capacity and a few Greenside residents (the development immediately south of the site) commented on a problem with flooding at the southern end of the site. Residents would need to see an improvement to crucial infrastructure before any further residential development is to take place on this site, including roads, sewers etc. Access to the site was also raised by a group as a major constraint to development, as entry to the village from the site could cause a potential blind spot for motorists and pedestrians.

HIGH18:

11.23 The majority view felt that this site should be discounted as it is located on a blind spot on the Ashford bound A28. This area is an accident black-spot and therefore any development would compromise road and pedestrian safety. It was also identified that this site represented a strategic gap in development and provided character to the settlement, as well as attractive views of the open countryside to the south. A minority view did feel that this site could be used for a small housing development and obtaining contributions from development to improve and maintain this area for the community was seen as a real opportunity, the possibility of locating the village hall here was also cited. Additionally, it was suggested that the northern section of the site be used for ‘natural’ infill development, inline with existing properties along the south of the A28.

HIGH19:

11.24 Site submitted post workshop

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)
HIGH20 (Identified by Group 1 and 3):

11.25 This area was put forward by group 1. Generally the group favoured this area as they felt it was in keeping with the existing built development opposite. The group felt that there would be limited visual impact from development in this location.

11.26 Group 3 identified the southeastern end of this site for possible infill housing development (the parcel of land east of the recreation ground, south of Beale Lands Farmhouse).

HIGH21 (Identified by group 1):

11.27 This site was put forward by a minority of group 1. The majority didn’t favour this as an idea as it was felt to be too linear in nature. It was also felt that this spread High Halden into the countryside more than necessary.

HIGH22 (Identified by Groups 2 and 3):

11.28 A number of ideas were put forward for this site.

11.29 It was suggested by one group that the existing village hall could be knocked down to create an access point off the A28 to a parcel of land beyond. This land could be developed to include a new village hall, a new shop and a small number of houses. Another group felt that this land of New Street Farm and the land to the north of New Street Farm could be used for housing development. However, some workshop attendees felt that this site was not suitable for any development, as the area acted as an informal recreation area, especially for dog walkers.

HIGH23 (Identified by Group 3):

11.30 This site was identified as a good location for a new village shop.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1:
HIGH06/08
HIGH10
HIGH05

Group 2:
HIGH06/08
SE corner of HIGH05

Group 3:
HIGH17
HIGH06/08

Group 4:
HIGH10
HIGH06,08

HIGH05

Conclusions:

11.31 Many residents in High Halden feel that in recent years the village has received a large amount of development, especially housing. They believe this has caused the services and infrastructure of the settlement to reach full capacity and further development would exacerbate the problem.

11.32 However, it was identified that if the infrastructure of the village was to be improved, specifically the road network and sewage pipeline, then limited, appropriate development could be acceptable.

11.33 The majority felt that developing the brownfield sites in the village should be carried out first, as many of the sites had been empty for long periods and would prevent greenfield areas being promoted for development.

11.34 The western side of the village would be the preferred general direction for growth, as this is where a number of local facilities can be found and would prevent linear development of the village.

11.35 It was identified at the workshop that any potential development should not be located too far out of the village and preferably within the confines of the existing settlement boundary. This would help prevent a segregated community and prevent the village expanding in an undesirable manor.

11.36 The re-establishment of the village shop was seen as paramount, and it was identified that this could be carried out in conjunction with the relocation of the village hall. The village hall is located on a small site, with no parking facilities. A new village hall and shop, with parking facilities were identified as a need by the community.

High Halden Questions

Question 22

It was generally felt that the East of the village was more sensitive to development pressure, due to issues such as important visual characteristics, the church and its setting, drainage problems in general and given that the area has already been subject to recent development. The western area of the village was therefore considered more suited to accommodate future development. Do you agree with this view?

Question 23

Do you agree that HIGH 18, or part of it, represents an important ‘green gap’ for the village and should be protected from development pressure?
Question 24

Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the High Halden workshop?
**12 Woodchurch**

**Date:** 25/02/2008

**Attendees:** Several Parish Councillors, including the Chairman and Vice-Chairman

**No. of Breakout Groups:** 1

**General Themes Identified:**

12.1 Any new development should be kept within the village envelope and should not extend out into the open countryside.

**Opportunities for Growth:**

12.2 Along Front Road, the Parish Council felt that there were several opportunities for new development along the western side.

12.3 Further south, the open areas north and south of the surgery were also seen as options to explore further with the objective of consolidating the line of development along this side of Front Road.

**Views on Character:**

12.4 The recognition that Woodchurch is not a compact village and that the land at the northern end of the village is significantly higher than at the southern end was seen as relevant factors in the future planning of the village, as was the location of the main village facilities such as the school, pubs, village hall and church at the northern end of the village.

**Types of Development:**

12.5 The discussion focused primarily around potential sites for residential development in the village but the Parish Council were also concerned with local employment issues and the ‘Green’.

12.6 A key objective of the Parish Council is to extend public access to the ‘Green’ in the centre of the village (see WOOD01 and WOOD14).

**Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:**

12.7 A question was raised regarding those submitted sites that did not appear on the main village map that was being discussed. Simon Cole agreed that a map showing all the sites submitted in the Parish would be sent to the Parish Council for their information but that those sites not on the map at the workshop were too distant from the village to be considered for DPD allocations and would not be taken forward for further consideration by the Borough Council.

12.8 There was a discussion as to whether the allocation of land in the Rural Sites DPD was the best means to trying to deliver the Parish Council’s objective, and it was agreed that the Borough’s officers would assess the pros and cons of various options of delivering this through the planning system.

**General Views on Submitted Sites:**

WOOD01:
A key objective of the Parish Council is to extend public access to the ‘Green’ in the centre of the village. To this end, Parish councilors were keen to consider an ‘enabling’ development on WOOD01 and adjoining land (part of Ransley Field) to the south (WOOD14) as a way of achieving the release of other areas here into the Parish’s control. The limit of such ‘enabling’ development was felt to be only the frontage areas to Lower Road and endorsement of these areas for development was clearly only on the basis that it would bring forward the rest of the land for the community’s benefit.

WOOD02:

This site was discounted for development as it was felt to lie outside of the village envelope.

WOOD03:

To the south of the village, concern was expressed about the WOOD03 site if it was to replicate the adjacent local needs Bridge Close scheme as a 100% local needs / affordable scheme. It was regarded as a potential housing site for open market housing with only a percentage of affordable housing as per the Core Strategy policy but was seen as a longer term option.

WOOD06:

The large majority of this site was also considered to be unacceptable for development, although a minority opinion was that the frontage part of the site next to Susan’s Hill could be suitable for small-scale residential development.

WOOD07:

WOOD07 was viewed favourably as a potential development site but only the front half of the site, directly adjacent to Front Road was seen as acceptable by the whole group. A minority view held that the rear part of the site could be considered as a possible employment location but otherwise it was felt that this part of the site should not be developed.

WOOD09:

This site was felt to be too small to be a realistic residential allocation but could be considered as an acceptable infill plot subject to detail.

WOOD12:

This site was discounted due to its poor access via Rectory Close past the primary school and its prominent position in the landscape.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

WOOD13:

Potential small infill plots were identified along the western edge of Front Road.

WOOD14:

The Parish Council were keen to look at this site as part of a wider scheme with WOOD01. By allowing development on these two sites, the parish council would like to extend access to the Green in the centre of the village.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:
12.18 Of the sites discussed, the Parish Council’s preferred choice for development was WOOD01 (subject to the ‘enabling’ development above) with the second choice being WOOD07 and similar sites on the western side of Front Road being third choice, WOOD13.

Conclusions:

12.19 It was felt that it would be acceptable for new appropriately scaled development to take place at Woodchurch providing it was kept within the village envelope and the future plans for increasing access to ‘the Green’ were brought forward.

12.20 It was agreed at the meeting that the Borough’s planning officers would assess the pros and cons of delivering ‘the Green’ scheme through the Tenterden and Rural sites DPD and whether or not this was the best option for delivering the proposal.

Woodchurch Questions

**Question 25**

Should there be ‘enabling development’ to bring about greater public access to the ‘Green’?

**Question 26**

Do the ‘gaps’ on the western side of Front Road provide suitable opportunities for new housing?

**Question 27**

Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Woodchurch workshop?
13 Rolvenden

Date: 25/02/2008

No. of Attendees: 32

No. of Breakout Groups: 3

General Themes Identified:

13.1 There was a strong view by all attendees that any growth should be as compact as possible and any new development should not extend into the open countryside.

13.2 Car parking was cited as a significant problem in the village, especially on street parking in Sparkeswood, and around the church and village hall. New parking facilities need to be provided in the village and any new developments need to be provided with enough parking spaces, so as not to accentuate the problem.

13.3 There was a strong opinion regarding the retention of the football club within the village – All participants supported that a new site must be found, that would accommodate 2 pitches (FA funding require a junior and senior pitch) especially if their current site was to be developed. It was made clear that the club have a current planning application submitted, for their re-location to a site adjacent to the working mens club in the south of the village. However, another potential site was identified adjacent to the existing cricket pitch and was discussed at the workshop, see below.

13.4 The relocation of Korkers sausage factory was identified as a key issue for the village. The site employs a number of local people and Korkers sausages are a renowned Rolvenden product. The factory requires larger premises to both expand and comply with new regulations. A new well designed factory within walking distance of Rolvenden is an immediate need for the community and the business.

Opportunities for Growth:

13.5 It was felt at the workshop that although there are potential development sites on the entrances and the outskirts of the settlement. There are currently better sites available within the village confines. Potentially sites on the periphery should only be put forward for development, if need requires it in future development plan documents.

13.6 The existing employment site at Windmill Farm was an important local site. The possibility of extending this site on adjacent land for additional small scale employment uses was supported by the majority of people.

Views on Character:

13.7 Rolvenden was seen to have a number of community facilities, which were important to local residents. These include shops, two pubs, a new village hall and a school with extensive playing fields. A number of local employment opportunities can also be found within and on the outskirts of the village, which employ a number of local people.

13.8 The area between the High Street and the Windmill was felt to be of particular importance to the setting of the village and the view from the Benenden direction towards the listed buildings of the High Street was much revered by local artists and walkers.

Types of Development:
13.9 It was identified that new housing, especially homes aimed at young families would help to keep the village school alive and would be a preference for the village. Affordable and Local needs housing would also help retain the younger population.

13.10 The following types of development would also be welcomed in the village:

- More car parking especially in Sparkeswood and around the village hall.
- An improved play area for young children and something for teenagers to do. This could possibly be supplied through an improved community sports facility.
- An increased number of small office and commercial units, possibly by enlarging Windmill Farm.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

13.11 A number of attendees at the workshop felt that there was scope for a small number of houses (possibly 10?) at Rolvenden Layne.

13.12 Traffic Speed along the A28 was registered as an issue, especially in terms of enforcement.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

ROLV02:

13.13 The majority of attendees felt that this site should not be brought forward in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD, as it was too small and located away from the main settlement. It was felt that any proposals for this former sewerage work site should be via planning application only. A minority identified that the site did have employment potential, but this was quickly dismissed as the access road to the site was felt to be particularly narrow.

ROLV03:

13.14 All groups identified this site as a site for future development and it was identified as their favoured sites for development by many people. The majority of attendees felt that this site was best suited for mixed-use development, with a number of small workshop, office units (like the neighbouring site) and some additional housing along the frontage. However, the delivery of this development, was a cause of great discussion at the workshop, with many attendees feeling that development of this site should only be allowed if the adjacent site is released as a new location for a the village Football Pitch (See additional site ROLV08)

ROLV04:

13.15 There was support for this site as many felt that it was the logical extension of the village and effectively filled the gap in the frontage, drawing the Gatefield Development into the village.

13.16 Many participants felt that it would be a good idea if development on this site followed the existing housing line with access coming off of Halden Lane. Additionally, a new pavement along the main road would be needed if this site was developed and a new site for the football field should be found before this site were to be brought forward.

ROLV07:

13.17 All participants felt that this site had little development potential in this LDF plan period. The site was detached from the main settlement, and other submitted sites should be promoted before this site was ever to be considered. Additionally, the adjacent site (ROLV09) should be developed before this site, to prevent gaps in the frontage and developing into the open countryside.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:
(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

ROLV08 (Identified by Groups 2 and 3):

13.18 Two groups favoured this site as a good location for a community sports facility and improved play area for both young and teenage children. New changing facilities, clubroom and a parking could be provided, which could then be used by the cricket and tennis clubs, as well as the football club that would relocate to the site. By situating the play areas alongside the better improved sports facilities, it would create a cohesive community facility that could be utilised by all residents. Additionally, by combining facilities it would help reduce costs for all interested parties. It can be noted that access to the site could be a problem, and the idea of providing access via ROLV03 was cited, as well as using the existing Bull Lane footpath.

ROLV09 (Identified by Groups 1, 2 and 3):

13.19 This site was discussed at length by all groups at the workshop and all groups identified that this site (like ROLV07) may have some housing development potential, but probably not in this plan period, as there were preferred sites in the village. It was however, identified that in the future this site should come forward before ROLV07, as not to produce an isolated development like the Gateshead development opposite. It was also identified that a corner of the site is the proposed location for the new Korkers sausage factory.

ROLV10 (Identified by Groups 1, 2 and 3):

13.20 All groups identified that the current Korkers sausage factory site could come forward for housing development, if a new site is found for the factory. Many people felt the site was centrally located for local amenities and in some people felt that housing would be an improvement over a factory in this part of the village. The opportunity to provide up to 6 dwellings on this site was cited, but not discussed at length.

ROLV11 (Identified by Groups 1 and 2):

13.21 There was discussion about the area of land that lies to the rear of Sparkeswood and there was some support for development here with the proviso that it was used to solve existing parking problems. Equally there was strong opposition to development of this area on the basis that it was an important undeveloped area, with a ‘Parkland Character’ which contributed to the setting of the settlement. It was identified by all participants that access problems to this site would need to be overcome if any development was to take place, one solution cited was the removal of a pair of semi-detached houses on Sparkeswood Avenue or access through the allotment site (ROLV14).

ROLV12 (Identified by Group 1 and 2):

13.22 Mixed views were raised over the potential of developing this site. One group strongly felt that absolutely no development should take place in this area, as it provided the picturesque views of Rolvenden from the Benenden direction and the area was well utilised by dogwalkers. The group felt that the view, the large number of listed buildings and the church, provided the most important setting of the village and should be conserved as is. Conversely, other people felt that this area did have some development potential, mainly due it central location to the High Street and the village school. A small number of people voted this area as one of their favoured sites.

ROLV13 (Identified by Group 3):
13.23 A number of people identified that this would be a favourable site for development, as it would only have a limited impact on the existing residents and as the land is relatively low lying the development would not impact on the eyeline from the main part of the village. It was also noted that the existing planning permission for 10 dwellings could be extended to cover the whole area, but the issues with access to the site would need to be overcome.

ROLV14 (Identified by Groups 1,2 and 3):

13.24 The allotment site was identified by all groups, but discounted for development due to its poor access onto the A28 and the loss of the facility if it were to be developed.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1:
ROLV04
ROLV09
ROLV12
Group 2:
ROLV08
ROLV04
ROLV03
Group 3:
ROLV03
ROLV04
ROLV13

Conclusions:

13.25 The favoured site for limited appropriate development in Rolvenden is ROLV04, this site was identified by all breakout groups.

13.26 A number of other potential development sites on the periphery of the settlement were also identified at the workshop. However, it was felt by the majority of attendees that it would be more appropriate to bring these sites forward in future development plan periods, as more suitable sites were currently available within the village envelope. All participants want to keep the settlement as compact as possible.

13.27 Housing suited to young families would be a preference as it would benefit the village school and affordable and local needs housing would also be a preference to retain the current population.

13.28 It was felt that the village could accommodate a small number of workshops.
In the short-term new sites need to be found for the football club and Korkers sausage factory.

Rolvenden Questions

Question 28
Do you agree with the outcome of the workshop that the most suitable site for residential development is ROLV04 – the site of the existing football pitch? If this site was to be developed what would be the most important issues that would need to be addressed in developing the site?

Question 29
If there was to be further development for employment or commercial uses what would be the best location for some limited development?

Question 30
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Rolvenden workshop?
14 Wye

Date: 08/03/2008

No. of Attendees: Approx 35

No. of Breakout Groups: 3

General Themes Identified:

14.1 The village of Wye can be identified as a settlement with a strong history and strong character. The village has a unique identity due to the balance that has been achieved through important transport and employment links, coupled with the considerable landscape constraints of both the AONB and river. Furthermore, considering the relatively close proximity of Wye to the large town of Ashford, Wye has managed to retain much of its rural charm and character, and is a favoured place to live and work for many people.

14.2 Due to the above reasons, there was concern from some members of the workshop about new development in the village. They felt that, simply because Wye is a larger village in itself, that should not be sufficient to justify further growth (a self-sustaining prophecy), particularly given infrastructure and landscape constraints. However, working with the notion that if Wye were to have some development, the following thoughts and aspirations were identified:

14.3 The future of Imperial college and its site is a key issue. It was suggested at the workshop that future development proposals for the village should not be considered until the definitive future of the college is understood. Another possibility was that any development of sites specifically owned by Imperial College should be put on hold in case short term development should prejudice long-term options for the future use of the Campus.

14.4 Phase 1 of the Parish Plan exercise was carried out by the Parish Plan Steering Group and forty six volunteers, supported by the Parish Council. It took the form of a land-use survey in which 12 questions were posed and 581 questionnaires were completed (which represented nearly 60% of all households in the parish). The Parish Plan Steering Group analysed the responses and the results and publicised them widely. The questionnaire included a number of ‘open’ questions that elicited more than 4,200 separate comments and a number of closed questions that required boxes to be ticked or left blank. From the analysis of all the responses it was possible to identify some key spatial planning issues in Wye and to derive clear principles and conditions to be taken into account by Ashford Borough Council in any assessment of development proposals for the parish.

14.5 A key context set by the workshop was the desire that Wye should not be allowed to grow in a sprawling way. Compact development, close to the settlement centre was the clear preference of the meeting.

14.6 Employment was important in the village, particularly the retention of the existing sites. Many villagers work within the village itself and the village incorporates several small scale business which should be retained.

Opportunities for Growth:

14.7 All groups believed that development should be as compact as possible and prevent development spreading into the surrounding countryside. Compact development in the centre of the village would also help to sustain local services and maintain an integrated community.

14.8 Identified constraints to development in Wye include the AONB, flooding, increasingly degraded infrastructure, important and attractive listed buildings and the Conservation Area.
All groups identified that the existing residential properties owned by Imperial College in the village could be considered for development and their potential to provide further accommodation taken into account. The question of whether these units would count towards the housing allocation for Wye was raised at the workshop. It was stated by the planners present that this was potentially difficult to argue and justify, but this was not understood by participants.

One group strongly felt that the general direction for any new growth should be northwards, as this would help prevent the suburban sprawl that was occurring in the southern direction and it would enable the desired compact development near to village services. Another group considered the possibility of northwards growth but very firmly rejected the idea. The other group took the conscious decision not to identify further sites. The idea of northwards growth was strongly opposed by some individuals in the final plenary session. All people identified that if development was to grow northwards the unique views of the church looking into the village as well of views of the StourValley looking out, should be taken into careful consideration if the area were developed.

Views on Character:

There was discussion about the importance of local character in the village and the need for new development to have regard to it. It was noted that there was a strong village design group.

There are key open spaces in the village; both public and private, including many allotments. Both the Greens were specifically identified as areas that should be retained and safeguarded from development pressure.

The village is seen as being very compact and it should be retained as such. The church and Wye College were identified as key buildings within the settlement.

There are important views of the village from the Downs that created the setting for the village.

There were key views of the village along the main routes into the village and from the Downs. From all sides of Wye, the approaches to the village were identified as particularly ‘rural’.

Types of Development:

There was strong support for local needs housing that would remain as such rather than general affordable housing. In terms of the type of housing that could be built there was support for a mix of housing types.

All future developments should be of a high quality design and be in-keeping with the surrounding area. The need for an integration of sustainable design and measures in new developments in the village was also identified by a number of people.

The need for facilities for younger residents, especially teenagers was identified by all groups. This support for the provision of facilities for young people was set out in section 9 of the Parish Plan report. It was also emphasised that the future Parish Plan phase 2 would be important in providing more details about the original survey completed by residents.

A multi-sports facility was put forward as a suggestion by one group. The group were unclear on exactly what sports would be used here, but two locations for the facility were cited; an area next to Lady J Thornhill Primary school, although some people felt this may be too far removed from the village and could raise safety fears for users, or re-using some of the Wye college buildings if they were to become available.

Another group commented on the need for a youth worker for the village to ‘help set things up’, a location (outside the village) for bikes to be used (motorised and other) and a coffee shop that could act as a meeting place for young people.
14.21 Some attendees felt that the overall need could be met by encouraging members of the community to make more use of the facilities already available at Wye College, specifically the swimming pool, tennis courts, squash courts and sports hall, if these are upgraded.

14.22 A number of new walkways and paths were proposed throughout the settlement, all of which would benefit the community. These included:

- A footpath fronting the river, which could be delivered through developer contributions from developing another site. However, it was accepted, that given the land is in private ownership, this might not be deliverable but it is still desirable.
- An additional pathway provided along Harville Road that would link Spring Grove School with the main part of the village and would encourage more pupils to visit the village.
- An improved footbridge crossing the railway.
- Upgrading some paths round the village for use by wheelchairs, children’s buggies etc.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

14.23 One group felt that roads in Wye were a key local issue. The Naccolt Road was considered to be in a particularly poor condition, but it was also understood that new or improved roads can induce more traffic and run the risk of opening up new areas for development.

14.24 Additional parking for the station was seen as a continuing issue for the village and there was concern about the failure to bring forward the area identified in the Local Plan for such a purpose (inc. the unauthorised use currently on part of that area). It was identified that many people now use Wye station as a commuting point into Ashford, to avoid the traffic problems associated with the ring road.

14.25 There is provision for parking in the centre of the village but it is generally underused. It was felt that the existing car park, lacked adequate signage, had poor lighting and had unmarked bays, all of which contributed to its poor usage. It was acknowledged that solving these issues with the existing car park would greatly help the current parking pressures at Wye, especially at peak times and would provide better facilities for visiting tourists.

14.26 In addition a concern was raised about making the car parks in Wye ‘Pay and Display’, as it was felt that this would encourage people to seek alternative locations to park, greatly adding to the congestion. The issue of parked cars on the road was also a concern but there was no desire to see lengths of ‘yellow lines’ in the heart of the village. In Scotton Street, there was some debate about the need for some passing bays to allow a freer flow of traffic along that road.

14.27 The railway crossing was discussed by all groups at the workshop. Generally, it was felt that although the crossing was a nuisance in terms of the time it takes to cross the railway, the crossing is actually a benefit to Wye, with some even suggesting it adds to its character. People felt that in its current context the crossing acts as a limit to the amount of development which can realistically come forward in Wye, and this constraint was generally welcomed. A road bridge crossing the railway was not favoured by participants as they felt this would result in a large amount of development coming forward. However, the need for the crossing to be automated to speed up crossing times was supported by most attendees.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

WYE01:
The small site at WYE01 was regarded by the majority as a potential development opportunity in principle, although the quality of access was questioned and the possible effects on the surrounding properties were stated. The quantum of the development was a consideration made by all groups, with the feeling that low density housing in keeping with the surrounding area was a preference.

WYE02:

Differing views were expressed over the potential development opportunity of this site. One group strongly opposed development here as it was felt that this would amount to ribbon development, which was strongly opposed in the Parish Plan. It would also damage the picturesque access point into the village from Harville Road and was vulnerable to flooding.

However, the other two groups felt that this site may have some development potential on a limited part of the site (WYE02b), specifically adjoining the existing development on Harville Road. A small minority view strongly supported development here and felt that it would be an improvement to the site and possibly create benefits to the community, for example a new pathway to Spring Grove school.

WYE03:

There was strong support for the development of this site as it would be compact and well screened. It was understood that there would need to be careful treatment of the boundary with existing houses and of the views to and from the village, but overall it was expressed that this site had potential to come forward. One group identified that this site could make a good mixed-use development if it was incorporated with the existing, adjoining commercial site.

WYE05:

All groups identified this site as a possible location for an extension to the station car park which is currently inadequate. It was felt by two of the groups that a small portion of the site could be used for either limited housing development or small employment units, to enable the rest of the site to come forward as the car park. However, it was identified that the physical constraints of the site, its narrow nature and the access constraints could prove difficult for these alternative uses.

WYE06:

All groups considered this site too large to come forward for development in its entirety. However, limited development was felt to be appropriate on the northern area of the site (WYE06b), adjacent to the existing housing and could possibly ‘round-off’ the existing built area and be bounded with a landscaped edge. All groups identified that access difficulties to this part of the site (e.g., through Little Chequers into Bridge Street) would need to be addressed and the possibility of opening up the rest of the site to development by an access road from Oxenturn Road should be rejected.

WYE07:

All groups decided that this site was an unacceptable option for development. This was due to its location on a key gateway into the village and the inherent flood risk on the site.

WYE08:

A wide ranging discussion was held in relation to the issue of the ‘impact of the closure of the College’. All groups were strongly in favour of promoting some sort of use for the site. Ideally this use would complement the village in a similar way to that which the college has done over the years. For example many of Wye’s villagers are employed at the college and the college
students use the goods and services that are provided in the village. To this end the group expressed the preference to retain the current college buildings for an educational use. If this was not achievable then a research facility was also desirable, promoting land-based research; crops, fruits bio-fuel, agricultural research were all touted as potential possibilities. Any policy for this site should not prejudice such possible development in the future.

Due to the size of this site it was divided into three sub-units for discussion:

WYE08a:

14.36 The ADAS site and buildings were felt to be of little architectural merit and were identified as a part of the college that did have development potential, if the site were to become available. All groups however, agreed that this development should be in the form of some sort of employment use rather than housing; and small offices, education uses and small industrial units were all sited as possibilities. Only a small minority of one group supported housing development on this site. In addition, it was identified that were some important trees located in this part of the college grounds and these should preserved and retained.

WYE08b:

14.37 It was identified by all groups that the central section of the College site should not be developed, as it is currently an undeveloped arable and wooded area.

WYE08c:

14.38 The existing employment uses housed at the southern end of the site surrounding Occupation Road were regarded as important uses for Wye that should be retained if possible.

WYE09:

14.39 To the south of the village, there was a strong feeling against the release of WYE09 for development. This site sits in a prominent position and it was felt that development here would damage an area that is very important to the setting of the village and a key gateway into the settlement. The views towards the Downs could also be distorted and this was not favoured. There was also concern about the potential scale of any future development here if even a small area was to be released now.

WYE10:

14.40 All groups decided that this site was an unacceptable option for development. This was due to the inherent flood risk of the site and that any development located here would damage the setting of the Mill.

WYE11:

14.41 It was felt that this site was probably the only realistic potential car park site on the village side of the railway. However, concerns were raised about the views that could be damaged if this site were to come forward for a car park and it was felt that the existing car parks within the settlement should be promoted in the first instance. One group decided that this site should only come forward on the condition of opening up the rest of the area for public access to the river (See WYE17).

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)
WYE12: (Identified by Group 3)

14.42 The group felt that this site represented an opportunity to focus development towards the northern area of the village, which was a principle behind the group’s approach to the future development of Wye. It was felt that development here would ‘round off’ the existing housing, and would represent compact growth near to the village. Group 2 considered the possibility of northwards growth in the area of WYE12 but very firmly rejected the idea. Group 1 took the conscious decision not to identify further sites.

WYE13: (Identified by Group 3)

14.43 Promoted by a small minority as a possible extension to Wye. General feeling was against this site however, due to it being a key entrance to the village, would not be in keeping with the built urban form of the periphery and overall it was felt to suffer from access difficulties. Group 2 considered the area encompassing WYE13 but very firmly rejected it. Group 1 took the conscious decision not to identify further sites.

WYE14: (Identified by Group 3)

14.44 Wye 14 was a site which is currently owned by the College. It was only promoted on the assumption that a like for like use, such as another educational establishment, or acceptable employment use, was unable to come forward to replace Wye College. The buildings located on this site were not considered to be of any particular merit and, if left vacant would be detrimental to the character of Wye, so therefore the potential to redevelop these buildings was considered desirable. Groups 1 and 2 did not consider area represented by this site.

WYE15: (Identified by Group 3)

14.45 This site was strongly favoured in the discussion although the ranking exercise doesn’t reflect this, mainly because there are other more suitable sites for development closer to Wye. However, the group were very keen for this site to be redeveloped so that this area is not left vacant or derelict. A hotel or conference centre was mooted as a possible use and one that would enable the grounds of Withersdane to remain undeveloped. The group rejected any suggestion that the gardens and grounds should be developed (and certainly not for housing).

WYE16: (Identified by Groups 2 and 3)

14.46 This is a selection of sites, put forward, all currently owned by the College. These were all seen as possible development opportunities should they be left vacant, again, all within the confines of the settlement. The group noted that most of the buildings currently owned by the College under WYE16 are very picturesque and added great value to the character of Wye. They therefore accepted that there is limited potential to what can actually be done with the buildings on these sites, and by extension, the type of housing units which could be located there. Group 1 discussed the possibility of Harwood House as a site for social housing.

WYE17 (Identified by Group 1):

14.47 Group 1 suggested that this area should be made available for public access to the river in conjunction with any allocation of WYE11.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

14.48 WYE03 was considered by the workshop to be the best of the identified sites but otherwise there was no consensus as to the potential acceptability of new development on other sites.

Conclusions:
The overriding feeling from the workshop was that:

- Wye should only receive limited development so as to retain its rural character and environment.
- If limited development were to occur in the village it should be located close to the existing services provided there. Wye should remain compact and sprawl should be avoided.
- The future of Imperial College in Wye has great significance on the form and shape of any future development in Wye. Any future development in the village should take account of any changes in the status and use of Imperial College’s campus at Wye. Workshop participants showed a strong preference for the site to remain in its original use (for education and research) and were concerned that decisions in the short term should not prejudice the long-term use of the campus for educational purposes.
- There is a preference for small clusters of small houses.
- There is an identified need for more facilities for young people in the village.
- Issues of parking in the village, both near to the station and in the village centre need to be addressed, specifically the underused car park in the village centre.
- Infrastructure needs to be adequate and proportionate to Wye as a rural village.
- Walking routes need to be encouraged and made accessible to the less mobile and to children living or schooling on the periphery of the village.
- Current employment and business ventures need to be retained and enhanced.

The above issues and principles emerged very clearly from the workshop proceedings.

Wye Questions

Question 31
One group felt that, in principle, future development in Wye should be located north of the village to: be well located to the existing services, round off the village, counter-balance the previous development southwards and prevent Wye extending further into the Countryside. What are your views on the matter?

Question 32
Should any further housing development be located west of the railway line?

Question 33
Should future development come forward on several smaller sites or one or two larger ones?

Question 34
The groups all agreed that the future of Wye College is of paramount importance to the future planning of the settlement. The general feeling was that,

- if possible, the College should be replaced by another educational establishment,
if this was not possible, then either a land based research facility or a more general employment use were desirable.

- the College buildings which are currently used for employment purposes should not be lost to residential use,
- steps should be taken to avoid derelict or vacant sites / buildings coming forward as a result of the College’s closure as this would be highly detrimental to the character of Wye,
- some of the existing College buildings, principally the existing halls of residence, could be refurbished to general market housing

What are your thoughts on these views?

**Question 35**

Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Wye workshop?
Wye Map

Wye
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15 Challock

Date: 10/03/2008

No. of Attendees: 24

No. of Breakout Groups: 2

General Themes Identified:

15.1 The workshop identified that Challock had a very sporadic urban form with a mixture of ribbon and cul-de-sac housing development. Due to these reasons, identifying the confines of the settlement was identified as particularly difficult.

15.2 The majority view felt that Challock could accept limited development in a number of small locations and this would not necessarily be detrimental to its existing character.

15.3 Any new development should be near to the settlement centre, with the preference that people should be able to walk to the services provided in the village.

Opportunities for Growth:

15.4 Ideally, it was felt that any future development should come forward on smaller sites as opposed to one or two larger sites. It was felt that this would blend in better with the current surroundings and the character of the settlement. Small cul-de-sac development was therefore favoured, with a range of different housing type and densities. The workshop identified that there were a number of these small infill sites available that could come forward to meet this need.

Views on Character:

15.5 All attendees identified that Challock was a sporadic development with a mixture of ribbon and cul-de-sac housing development.

15.6 The village has a good supply of green space, which provides an attractive setting to the settlement centre as well as leisure space for the village residents.

Types of Development:

15.7 There was a strong desire to see more local needs housing at Challock, not only for young families but also for Challock’s sizeable older population. Affordable housing was also desirable to allow people who are currently unable, to make their first step on the property ladder. Generally, more executive housing was not required, as this was out of reach for many people in the village.

15.8 One group were keen to incorporate more office development within the village. However, it was felt that there was no real need for more, small industrial/workshop units as there was already a number of vacant units to be found in the village.

15.9 Overall it was felt that community facilities were well provided for at Challock and these facilities met the needs of the existing population, especially green spaces in the area. However, a minority did suggest that a skate park could be desirable for the younger population, as there were limited facilities to cater for these needs in the area.

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:
15.10 Considerable debate was aired regarding the size of the roundabout. It was suggested that the roundabout be bigger to slow traffic down, as it is currently an accident ‘hotspot’. However, it was felt that the surrounding land could be a constraint to making these improvements. Further traffic calming measures would also be welcomed, as the speed and frequency of cars along the A251 and A252 is a real issue and concern for the village.

15.11 It was identified that better public transport provision is needed in the village, as the current bus service is very infrequent and there is a large elderly population in the village who do not have access to a car.

15.12 The group felt that the school played a very important role in the village. However, the area currently suffers from traffic congestion at peak times and car parking is particularly problematic. The majority of attendees believed that housing development in this area would only exacerbate this problem.

15.13 A concern was raised about the lack of mains drainage and mains gas provision in the village, especially if more houses are to be built in the village.

**General Views on Submitted Sites:**

**CHAL01:**

15.14 This site was unanimously ruled out for development as it is an important open space for the village and provides superior views of the rolling countryside to the south.

**CHAL02:**

15.15 Differing views were expressed over the potential development of this site. One group considered that this site was unsuitable for development, as it is an important open space located along the entrance to the village centre. However, the other group felt that due to its excellent, central location it did have development potential and housing for the elderly was identified as a possibility.

**CHAL03:**

15.16 The majority of this site was ruled-out for development, as it was felt to be an important open space, providing good views of the open countryside. However, the small parcel of land to the north, in line with the existing properties was felt to be acceptable for housing, as it continued the ribbon development characterised in the area. Although, it was identified that this site had the potential to provide a small scale housing development and could be a good location for local needs housing, the access to the site would need to be improved.

**CHAL04 and 07:**

15.17 Both of these sites were ruled out for housing development as it would ruin the character of the area and the sites are located too far out of the village to be considered suitable. However, it was identified by one group that these sites may be suitable for employment development if there was reasonable demand in the area, this was a minority view.

**CHAL05:**

15.18 Strong mixed views were felt about this site. One group definitely did not favour this site. They felt it allowed important views out into the countryside and was unrelated to the main part of the village. The site is located in an area that is a key entrance to the settlement and should be retained thus. Conversely, this site was discussed as a potential site for affordable units as a
whole. Given the existing terraced housing adjacent to the site it was suggested the affordable units be in the same style/capacity as those existing. Access to the site from the busy Faversham road was not considered a big issue, but suggested that the footpath which runs from the back of the site, past the village hall be opened up to allow better pedestrian access to the village centre.

CHAL06 and 11:

15.19 Both groups viewed these sites as a whole and both felt the land had development potential. The site was seen as an infill site, located near to the village centre and its associated services. However, the scale of the development identified by each group did vary. One group only favoured development located to the front of the area, near to the road, to lessen the impact on existing residents. However, the other group suggested office development towards the back of the site and housing for the remainder of the area. The density and type of housing development was not discussed by either group.

CHAL08:

15.20 Overall this site was strongly favoured for housing. The site is well related to the village and is close to the centre. Crossing the main road was not considered to be a barrier, although access to the site was discussed as a potential issue. The majority of attendees believed that these issues could be addressed.

CHAL09:

15.21 The overriding concern for developing CHAL09 was the access issues to the site off of the Faversham Road, as it is located close to the roundabout. Due to this reason mixed views were identified regarding the development potential of the site. Some people felt the site was unsuitable for development, whereas as other group members felt that the site could accommodate up to 6 units and would be a good site for development as it was well screened and located within relatively close distance to the village centre. It was also suggested that the development of CHAL09 could tie in well with neighbouring sites in terms of alignment of development.

CHAL10:

15.22 Both groups ruled out this site for development and additionally identified that the area immediately west of the site should be protected from future development. This area provides important open views of countryside and is an important ‘green area’ for the settlement.

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

CHAL12 (Identified by Group 2):

15.23 This site raised some conflicting debate on whether suitable for housing. One suggestion was whether housing could be accommodated towards the west of the site with the east of the site becoming a car park for the primary school. As residents mentioned, this area becomes very congested during school hours and the debate was that more housing in this area would only negatively contribute to this problem. It was a minority view that this site be considered for housing.

CHAL13 (Identified by Group 2):

15.24 This was considered a suitable site for infill of five or more houses to create a more natural boundary to development which exists along The Lees.

CHAL14 (Identified by Group 1):
15.25 The group put this forward for housing development. They felt it was well located and could round off existing development in that area. However, the ranking exercise showed that other areas were more preferable.

CHAL15 (Identified by Groups 1 and 2):

15.26 This area was considered suitable for development and would be brought forward as an extension to the submitted site CHAL09. The group felt that the area is well screened and was in close proximity to the centre of the village. The issue of access was raised as an issue.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1:

CHAL08
Small northern part of CHAL03 fronting the road

Southern half of CHAL11, fronting the road and adjacent to existing properties.

Group 2:

CHAL09,15
Small northern part of CHAL03 fronting the road

CHALL11

Conclusions:

15.27 The village of Challock can be seen to have a spread out, sporadic form with a number of different housing sizes and types. To this end, future development in Challock can be relatively flexible. However, there is no identified need for large-scale housing development sites in the village, as there are smaller sites that could easily deliver more appropriate scaled development as the need requires it.

15.28 It was identified that the requirement for more commercial space was limited, as there were currently empty units available in the village. The need for small office units was identified as a potential, small need. Community facilities are also well catered for in the village, especially green areas and the village hall.

15.29 Traffic pressure and parking throughout the village was seen as a real issue, especially outside of the village school. Traffic calming measures and appropriate parking in any new development should not accentuate this problem and preferably help to reduce it.

Challock Questions

Question 36

The groups felt that in general the Green Lane area and the area south of The Lees were particularly visually important aspects to Challock’s character. They felt the majority of this area should be safeguarded from development. What are your thoughts on this?
Question 37

The groups felt that development should be located within easy walking distance of the village centre and the services it provides. They also felt that most areas promoted fulfill this function. Do you agree with these views?

Question 38

Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Challock workshop?
16 Hamstreet

Date: 26/03/2008

No. of Attendees: 19

No. of Breakout Groups: 2

General Themes Identified:

16.1 The village of Hamstreet can be identified as a settlement with good transport links and a number of village shops and services. The settlement has a mixed community, with many young families and good community spirit. Although, the village is not adverse to new appropriately scaled development, it was identified at the workshop that the village has seen a large amount of development in recent years. There is a concern that the village could continue to increase in size and, if that were to happen, this would also result in concerns about the capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with the increased number of people.

16.2 The village school is an important community hub for the villagers and particular problems were identified regarding the situation of the school in the village. The school is currently under supplied with playing fields, but over subscribed with children. A concern was raised regarding additional development in the village as this could potentially increase the number of children at the school.

Opportunities for Growth:

16.3 All new development should be located as close to the village centre as possible, with people having the ability to walk to the village facilities being preferred. It was felt that there are appropriate existing sites that could accommodate this limited growth near to the centre of the village, particularly the extension to Lancaster Close.

16.4 Growth on the periphery of the settlement is not wanted or needed in this development plan period. However, two small possible commercial plots were identified on the southern approach to the village (see HAM08 and HAM09)

16.5 A concern was raised regarding the number of large executive style homes that have been built, as smaller homes would be preferable. Many people felt that larger homes were not needed by many families and were financially out of reach for most residents, a larger number of smaller homes could be located on a site.

Views on Character:

16.6 Lancaster Close was seen as one of the better designed developments in Hamstreet in recent years. There was ample parking within the development and the houses were well designed and attractive. It was also felt that the development was well screened and fitted well into the existing village.

16.7 Orlestone View was seen as a poor development in the village, as the housing density was too great. There were too many large houses on a very small site. The parking on the site has not been well designed, as there are too few spaces for the type of dwellings. Parking is seen as a real contentious problem, and it was even cited that the Fire Service has difficulty getting around the development. There is also no green space in the development.

Types of Development:
Future developments should contain a mixture of dwelling sizes with smaller dwellings being the preference. Bungalows for the elderly were cited as a need in the village, as well as Local Needs housing.

A pavement from the main part of the village towards the garden centre to the south would be welcomed by the villagers. The grass verge was identified as being wide enough to accommodate this need.

A small number of workshop and office units would be welcomed in the village, although these should be located in the outskirts of the settlement, so as to not increase the traffic through the settlement.

There should be adequate parking in any development (minimum of 2 spaces in rural area) and green spaces. Detached garages should be large enough to fit a car in!

Other Issues/Concerns Raised at the Workshop:

Parking is also a problem outside of the school at peak times, along Warehorne Road, and close to Parker Farm. Parking for the school was identified as a specific need.

Traffic is a particular problem outside of the school and along Bourne Lane. Lorries using the village to get to Tenterden also accentuate the problem. Slip roads off of the by-pass onto the Warehorne Road were seen as a way of removing traffic from this part of the village. Traffic calming measures would be welcomed to the south of the village and outside of the school.

An additional concern was raised at the workshop regarding the sewerage works and pumping station. These facilities were believed to be working at capacity, and a concern was raised regarding additional development in the village and how this would exacerbate the problem.

Extension to the cemetery at the Parish Church in Orlestone was required, with new access and additional car parking.

General Views on Submitted Sites:

HAM01:

Potential conflicting ideas were aired regarding this site, although both groups agreed that the wooded area towards the north of the site should definitely not be developed as it would damage the entrance way into the village, and therefore both of the group discussions centred exclusively round the southern portion of the site.

One group cited the possibility of relocating the school to this site, so that the school had additional parking and the potential to increase its capacity in the future. However, in the end, a majority favoured providing the means for the school’s expansion next to its current site on the western side of the Ashford Road if possible. This group was strongly opposed to any form of housing development on this site.

Conversely, the other group felt that the southwest corner of the site could be used to supply the school with a new playing field and parking. This could be done either directly or by relocating the road eastwards and inserting a roundabout, so that the school could grow on their own side of the road. The idea of building some housing in this area was also cited as a possibility (most thought only Local needs housing was acceptable), so as developer contributions could pay for the new school facilities and/or road improvements.

HAM02/03:
16.19 Differing views were expressed regarding the potential development of this site. Although both groups identified that this area was at considerable flood risk and the views across the Romney Marsh would need to be taken into consideration. One group felt that due to this increased risk, the site would be unsuitable for any housing development, but could potentially be utilised for a commercial uses if the demand was sufficient. Conversely, the other group identified this site for housing development, suggesting that the site would be an extension of Orlestone View. It was felt that developing here could actually improve the view for the current Orlestone View residents, as the vacant farm buildings currently on the site are particularly unattractive. However, it was identified that the access to the site should not be through Orlestone View, as this was already too narrow with considerable parking problems. An alternative access would be needed, potentially utilising the existing private road.

HAM05:

16.20 Both groups identified that this site did have some limited housing development potential, but the access difficulties of the site would need to be overcome to allow the site to come forward. Currently, the only two access points to the site were particularly narrow and constrained and could therefore be detrimental for any potential development. However, the site itself was seen as a fairly good location, as the new housing would be well screened and the site is located near to the village centre. It was suggested that perhaps around 50% of the site should be the maximum released in any event and that this should not be seen as a signal for future land releases down towards the A2070.

HAM07:

16.21 This site was identified as having particularly poor access, but had been the location of a previous dwelling. However, instead of looking at this site as a single plot, both groups at the workshop felt that this site should be considered alongside the adjoining site HAM10 (the Lancaster Close extension) and therefore did have some development potential (see Additional sites identified at workshop).

Additional Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites were not discussed by the whole workshop, but were identified by individual breakout groups)

HAM08 and HAM09 (Identified by Group 2):

16.22 Two sites were identified to the south of the village which could potentially be used for commercial development (housing development was definitely not wanted in this location). The site adjoining the garden centre (HAM09) was particularly favoured for small workshop/office units as the site is currently brownfield, containing a number of derelict greenhouses.

HAM10 (Identified by Groups 1 and 2):

16.23 The land at the northern end of Lancaster Close, contained within the previous Local Plan allocation, was perceived by many of the workshop attendees as a site that would definitely come forward for housing development at some point in the future and was regarded by many as a natural extension to the new housing at Lancaster Close. It was felt to be relatively self-contained, screened and adequately accessed and was the preferred location for future growth by the majority of people attending the workshop. However, it was identified that any new development here would need to be in keeping with the adjacent Lancaster Close and the dwellings should have space between them (low density) and the site should contain green areas.

HAM11 (Identified by Group 2):
This site was initially put forward by the group for a small number of houses. However, after a lengthy discussion it was decided that this site should not be promoted for development, due to the previous planning application refusals, which centred round ‘highways issues’.

HAM12 (Identified by Group 1):

This area was seen as a potential extension to the HAM10 site above as it was close to the railway line and station and therefore relatively self-contained. Doubts were expressed about its availability for development but if it were available, then it was a favoured location.

Favoured Development Sites Identified at Workshop:

(please note these sites are in no specific order)

Group 1:
HAM10
HAM12
HAM05 (part)

Group 2:
HAM10
HAM09 for commercial only

Conclusions:

The favoured site for any future development in the village of Hamstreet is HAM10, the Lancaster Close extension. This site received a significant majority of the votes at the workshop and was already perceived by many people as an area for future development.

If any new development is to take place, the potential increase of students to the village school and the increased number of cars would need to be taken into careful consideration.

The good design of any new development is paramount, especially the car parking facilities and green spaces. The Village Design Statement should be taken into account in all future developments.

The size of dwellings required also needs investigating further, as it was felt by many people that the village was becoming rather ‘top-heavy’ with executive dwellings.

A need for affordable Local Needs housing in Hamstreet was identified at the workshop.

Hamstreet Questions

Question 39

Do you agree with the workshop that an extension to Lancaster Close is the best location for new residential development?
Question 40
Should any land be released for new housing on the western side of the village, e.g behind the school, or, to the south, as an extension to the Orlestone View development?

Question 41
Do you have any further comments to make on any of the outcomes of the Hamstreet workshop?
17 Rural Planning Policy Issues

Introduction - The topic-related policy coverage of the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD

17.1 The Ashford Borough Local Plan was formally adopted by the Borough Council in June 2000. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provided for the saving of Local Plan policies until the 27th September 2007, after which they would expire.

17.2 Through consultation with the Secretary of State, the Council has been allowed to save some Local Plan policies beyond September 2007 and they will remain in place until they are superseded by policies in the Local Development Framework.

17.3 All of these saved policies will need to be reviewed and updated at some stage in the preparation of the overall LDF. This review might occur in either a site allocation document, such as the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD, or in the Generic Development Control DPD, due to be published in early 2009.

17.4 The list below indicates which of the ‘saved’ Local Plan policies it is felt to be logical to review as part of the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD. These policies either deal with a rural policy issue, and there is a case to review the existing policy due to its frequency of use. A complete version of the polices included in this table can be viewed in Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HG5</td>
<td>Housing development coming forward on sites which are not on the proposals map but are within Ashford, Tenterden, Wye, Charing and Hamstreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG6</td>
<td>Minor housing development or infilling coming forward on sites which are not on the proposals map but are within 37 identified settlements (ranging from Ashford to smaller scale rural settlements such as Stone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG7</td>
<td>Housing development outside the village confines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG15</td>
<td>Delivering local need housing schemes in the rural area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>Expanding existing business premises in Tenterden and the rural area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE2</td>
<td>Restricting the loss of existing business sites and premises in Tenterden and the Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>Promoting new employment development at Tenterden and rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE5</td>
<td>The change of use of non-residential rural buildings into other non-residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE6</td>
<td>The change of use of listed or traditional agricultural buildings into residential use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE7</td>
<td>The conversion of buildings in the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN27*</td>
<td>All development falling within the identified Special Landscape Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH5</td>
<td>Changes of use or new development coming forward within the identified Tenterden shopping frontage area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH6*</td>
<td>The retention and change of use of village shops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.5 This section of the report gives you the opportunity to comment on the following key issues and what you feel are the best options available to the Council to address these issues in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.
18 Issue A - The Phasing of the Development Allocations

18.1 One of the major issues for the scope of the Tenterden & Rural Sites DPD is how it should deal with the phasing of land for new development. Policy CS6 of the LDF Core Strategy sets out a broad phasing approach which splits the Core Strategy period into two phases with development allocations to be released in each phase.

18.2 This means that there are two main options for the scope of site allocation in this DPD. Either the DPD should identify land for new development to accommodate all of the housing requirements in the rural areas set out in the Core Strategy but identify which of those sites should be developed out first and which should be left for the later phase, or, alternatively, the DPD should only allocate those sites to meet the housing targets in Phase 1 (to 2013) with a recognition that the DPD will be reviewed to make the allocations for Phase 2 subsequently.

18.3 History suggests that a large majority of rural housing sites that are allocated in Local Plans are developed promptly and therefore a stricter approach to phasing of their release is necessary to ensure sites are brought forward in a more measured and sequential way. However, it can also be argued that there advantages in the greater certainty of knowing where development is likely to happen even if it is some years away.

Please choose from one of the following 3 options. Do you feel the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD should:-

A1
Allocate all the sites needed to 2021 but identify in which phase each one should be developed?

Or:

A2
Allocate only those sites needed to be developed in Phase 1 and review the DPD subsequently to separately allocate sites for Phase 2?

Or:

A3
Just allocate all the sites needed to 2021 without any phasing restrictions?
19 Issue B - The identification of the village confines of rural settlements

19.1 Both policy HG5 and HG6 of the Local Plan refer to the confines of the settlement. How these confines should be identified will be discussed in this section. The Council's current approach goes back a number of years to the policy established in the Rural Ashford Local Plan that was first adopted in the late 1980s. The approach is to rely upon a written definition of what constitutes the confines of a settlement i.e. the limits of continuous development, including narrow gaps which may be suitable for infilling by one or two dwellings only, forming the existing built-up area of the town and village.

19.2 Over time and through case history, the boundary tends to become established. The perceived drawback with this approach is that there is no clearly defined line drawn on a map that, it is suggested, gives certainty to a community and to developers and landowners.

19.3 These comments go the heart of this issue, namely whether the additional time and resource necessary in preparing the evidence base for detailed, defendable village boundaries to be defined on plan, actually would help to resolve individual cases any quicker or more clearly when planning applications are subsequently considered.

19.4 It is clear that such an exercise would be time consuming, given that all settlements which would be considered suitable for windfall housing development would need an identified boundary based on a thorough assessment of sites and planning history. All of which could lead to a longer and more contentious Examination of the DPD.

19.5 There are two basic options to consider. Firstly, to retain the existing policy approach and rely upon a written definition and continue to build upon existing case history to help the definition of where the boundary of the settlement is; or, alternatively, to show the ‘confines’ of the settlement on the Proposals Map map. This alternative approach would involve detailed work to establish where a defendable settlement boundary lies. Currently this work would need to be undertaken to include all 33 settlements mentioned under policy HG5 and HG6.

19.6 A possible third option would be to retain the current written definition but to amend the definition of ‘confines’.

19.7 As part of the preparation work into this report the Council reviewed how other local authorities deal with this issue. Most Kent authorities have used a boundary line drawn on their proposals map to identify the confines of some of their urban areas and rural settlements. Only Canterbury and Ashford have not used a line to define rural settlement boundaries. In all other cases, only rural settlements outside of the urban area that are able to support additional infilling have either been listed within policy hierarchies or identified on their proposals map by using a defined line. In most cases, authorities have not used a line to define rural settlement boundaries where the settlement is unable to support any additional development or where development would be detrimental to maintaining the settlements existing character and appearance. Many authorities state that development will not be permitted outside of the defined confines of the rural settlement unless there is strong justification through other development plan policies. There does not appear to be any advantage when the approach is challenged at a planning appeal.

Please choose from one of the following options. Do you feel the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD should:-

B1
Continue with the existing approach of defining the confines of the settlement (e.g by a written definition?)
OR

B2
Continue with this existing approach but review the definition?

OR

B3
Draw the settlement boundary on the Proposals Map for all / some of the rural settlements?
20 Issue C - 'Windfall' housing policy

20.1 Residential development which comes forward on sites outside of those allocated in Local Plans / LDFs are known as housing ‘windfalls’. Historically, the majority of the rural housing windfalls come forward on small sites, usually incorporating less than 5 dwellings.

20.2 Currently policies HG5 and HG6 of the Local Plan deal with proposals for windfall residential development within the ‘confines’ of various identified settlements. In HG5, developments of 5 or more dwellings are acceptable in principle within the larger settlements of Tenterden, Charing, Hamstreet and Wye, subject to general criteria about location, displacement of other uses and good design being met. Policy HG6 permits developments of less than 5 dwellings and infilling within the ‘confines’ of a much wider range of rural settlements (as well as the HG5 settlements), again subject to the same detailed criteria.

20.3 Although the purpose of policy CS6 of the Core Strategy is specifically to guide the location of site allocations, it would also seem to be the logical place to begin a review of windfall policies. Policy CS6 has established a three-tier settlement hierarchy in the rural areas, with Tenterden at the top, Charing, Hamstreet and Wye in a second tier and 9 other settlements in a third tier. The top two tiers of this hierarchy only include those settlements identified under policy HG5 of the Local Plan. All CS6 settlements are referred to in policy HG6.

20.4 A key issue to consider when looking at the issue of rural windfall policy, is whether the Council will be able to rely on houses delivered on ‘windfall’ sites to meet its overall housing targets, as it has done in the past. This issue has been debated at the Core Strategy Examination.

20.5 Current Government planning policy now has a general presumption against local authorities relying on windfall development to meet housing delivery targets. As a result Local Authorities may be required to allocate more sites for development in order to meet their land supply requirements. Given this, one option for the Council would be to adopt a more restrictive windfall policy approach, in order to limit the number of houses being delivered outside the LDF allocation process.

20.6 Overall, it remains likely that ‘windfall’ schemes are going to continue to come forward as planning applications and so there seems to be three broad policy options available to deal with these schemes:

- a) keep the same basic approach as existing policies HG5 and HG6, i.e. allow larger windfall schemes in the larger settlements (Tenterden, Charing, Hamstreet and Wye) and minor development in a wider range of other settlements (beyond those referred to in CS6);
- b) take a less restrictive approach by allowing larger windfall schemes in all CS6 settlements;
- c) take a more restrictive approach by restricting, the size and / or location of where windfall schemes would be acceptable in principle (e.g. allow only minor development or infilling or reduce the number of settlements where any residential development would be acceptable).

20.7 Of these options, each has advantages and disadvantages. The main differences are that option (c) would reduce the amount of residential development coming forward on windfall sites.

20.8 The delivery of windfall development would probably remain similar under options (a) and (b), although option (b) would probably result in larger schemes being accepted in a wider group of settlements than option (a).
20.9 Policy HG7 of the Local Plan covers the issue of new residential development outside the confines of an existing village, in the countryside, and adopts a very restrictive approach, only allowing it to occur where there is strong justification to do so. This is a very long-standing policy approach which continues to be supported by national and Kent-wide (Kent & Medway Structure Plan) policy. As such, it is not thought that there are any realistic alternatives to the continuation of this approach in the Tenterden & Rural Sites DPD.

Please choose from one of the following 3 options. Do you feel the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD should:-

C1
Continue to adopt the existing policy approach to windfall development?

OR

C2
Alter the existing approach slightly to allow larger windfall schemes in all CS6 settlements?

OR

C3
Tighten the windfall approach to restrict the size, number and / or location of where windfall schemes would be acceptable?
21 21 Issue D - Local Needs 'Exception' Sites

21.1 Currently local needs housing is provided through an ‘exception sites’ policy in the Local Plan which permits residential development to occur on sites that are not allocated within the plan and would not otherwise be acceptable for such purposes. This approach is well established and has delivered 23 rural local needs schemes in the Borough and overall it can be considered successful.

21.2 An alternative to this approach would be to seek to allocate local needs housing on identified sites for the Plan period. However this approach does have some disadvantages. It would be very difficult to try to identify, in a credible and sound way, the future demand for local needs in every rural settlement for the entirety of the Plan period as, by its nature, demand for local needs housing is a very localised, exceptional, and sensitive issue which is subject to fluctuations over time. A further potential disadvantage of this approach is to raise the ‘hope’ value of such sites by identifying them for development that may prejudice the ability to bring forward such sites for local needs housing.

21.3 A third option would be to seek a mix of the two approaches. For example, the DPD could allocate those local need sites which are known to be needed at the time of the DPD’s production, whilst also incorporating an exception site policy to react to any subsequent demand for local need housing. However a concern with this approach, is that if the adoption of DPD is delayed, it could result in a delay in the delivery of the local need schemes identified in the DPD.

21.4 Policy CF16 of the Local Plan raises similar issues in respect of community facilities by allowing them to be permitted as an exception to normal policies of restraint on sites within or adjoining villages. This policy can enable land for community facilities to be provided more readily than might otherwise be the case, although it does need to be demonstrated that the service cannot be adequately provided at an existing community facility in the locality.

21.5 As part of the preparation work for this report, the Council reviewed how all the Kent Local Planning Authorities currently deal with the issue of delivering local needs housing. This exercise showed that all of the Kent LPA’s that incorporate a rural area within their boundary, adopt an exception sites policy to address the issue of delivering rural local need housing.

In terms of the issue of exception sites and local needs housing, please choose from one of the following three options. Do you feel the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD should:-

D1 Continue to adopt the existing ‘exception sites’ policy approach?

OR

D2 Seek to allocate all local needs housing sites?
Provide a mixture of allocating some local needs schemes whilst also including an exception sites policy approach?

In terms of the issue of exceptions sites and community facilities, do you feel the Tenterden and rural sites DPD should:

Retain a policy to permit new community facilities on ‘exception’ sites?
22 Issue E - Rural Employment Policy

22.1 Rural employment is a complex topic. It plays a vital role in sustaining jobs and promoting a viable rural economy. Rural employment can cover an array of uses, from offices to agriculture to light industrial. Unlike housing, not all employment uses necessarily need, or indeed, should, be located near to the villages, (e.g. abattoirs). In some cases, rural employment can only realistically function in a more remote location. Others, such as the agricultural industry, help maintain and add character to the open countryside. However, this needs to be balanced with the need to protect and enhance the countryside for the enjoyment of all and avoid inappropriate levels of built development in the rural area.

22.2 Finding the right balance between allowing appropriate employment development that will benefit the rural economy, with the need to protect the countryside for its own sake will be a critical role for the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.

22.3 Government planning policy on this issue supports, in principle, a positive approach to economic development in rural areas subject to caveats about the scale and impact of such development.

22.4 The Council’s current approach to new and existing business premises is set out in policies RE1, RE2 and RE3 of the Local Plan.

22.5 Policies RE1 and RE3 generally support proposals to expand existing business premises and allow the construction of new-build premises within the confines of Tenterden and the villages, subject to a number of criteria related to the potential impact of the development on its surroundings.

22.6 Policy RE2 seeks, in principle, to retain existing business sites and premises for a business use but includes the criterion that allows a change of use if it can be demonstrated that an employment use would no longer be viable – this is often the crucial element in deciding whether a change of use scheme meets the policy or not.

22.7 The Council’s overarching policy is set out in policy CS6 of the Submitted Core Strategy, and broadly encourages new commercial development at Tenterden, and potentially at other villages where a local business or community need is demonstrable. A clear stance on seeking to avoid the loss of existing employment sites in Tenterden and the villages is also taken. However, there is no explicit support in these policies for new employment premises in other more remote rural locations unless it is a small-scale extension to an existing premise.

22.8 There is potentially a wide range of options that could be considered to address all of these issues, many of which lie around detailed caveats that might be attached to any policy in order to place appropriate restrictions and safeguards on any new developments, especially in more sensitive locations. However, it is the main principles that need to be addressed first and which are the focus of the Options below.

22.9 Extensions to rural business premises – at what point is it reasonable to expect businesses to re-locate to larger premises rather than continue to expand on their existing site? This can become an issue where either a business is in a remote location and grows to a size which would normally be inappropriate in such a location, or where a business in a more restricted environment,
such as in the heart of a village, grows to a point where it begins to generate adverse impacts (e.g. more traffic movements) on nearby residents. In either case, where the business is an important local employer, the social and economic effects of possibly losing that employer can be particularly important.

**E1**

Should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD allow more, or less, on-site expansion of existing business premises? Should this apply to the whole rural area, or just to sites in villages, or in the countryside?

**22.10** The retention of employment premises – how important is it to seek to retain employment sites in Tenterden and the villages? There is often considerable economic pressure to redevelop employment sites in the villages for housing particularly if the existing employment uses have either ceased or are struggling to make ends meet. One argument is that such changes of use away from employment should be resisted in principle as it will lead villages to become ‘dormitories’ with little economic activity and the gradual erosion of the rural economy and village facilities. An alternative view is that many such employment sites are, in fact, detrimental to the amenity and character of the village and that a redevelopment would provide much-needed new local housing whilst improving the local environment. One of the key factors used in the current policy relates to a test of economic viability through the marketing of the premises for a reasonable period of time in order to assess whether there is any demand for a continued employment use there. This has been used as a means of indicating whether employment premises are genuinely redundant or whether alternative forms of employment could, on reasonable terms, be viable. Is this a suitable way of assessing a proposal to change the use of an employment premises, or is such a test unreasonable or unnecessary?

**E2a**

Should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD continue to have a presumption in policy against the loss of existing employment sites to housing development?

**E2b**

If yes, then how reasonable is it to apply a test of economic viability to determine if an employment site should be redeveloped for housing?

**22.11** New employment buildings – how encouraging should the Council be towards new employment buildings either within or adjoining settlements or in the wider countryside? This question is basically about finding the appropriate balance between the needs of the rural economy and the need to protect and enhance the character of the countryside and residential amenities.
Existing policy is supportive, in principle, of new employment development in the villages but not outside them and yet much economic activity takes place in the countryside – to what extent, if any, should policy be amended to provide greater support for such activity and what limits should be placed on this to ensure the right balance is achieved?

E3

Should the Tenterden and Rural sites DPD change the policy to allow more new build employment premises outside villages? If yes, what limits (if any) should be applied?
23 Issue F - Conversion of existing buildings in the rural areas

23.1 Government policy in PPS7 supports the re-use of appropriately sited buildings in the countryside “where this would meet sustainable development objectives”. It is stated that re-use for economic development purposes will usually be preferable but residential conversions may also be acceptable in some locations and for some types of buildings. PPS7 is also supportive of the replacement of suitably located, permanent buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes.

23.2 Policy RE5 of the Local Plan deals with the re-use of non-residential rural buildings. It allows, in principle, re-use for employment, leisure or non-residential tourist related uses subject to several detailed criteria.

23.3 Policy RE6 of the Local Plan deals with the re-use of listed or other traditional agricultural buildings that have architectural or historic value and allows, in principle, their conversion to residential use subject to two detailed criteria.

23.4 Policy RE7 of the Local Plan simply relates to the imposition of a condition to remove the rights to enlarge or alter converted property or erect buildings within their curtilage when permission is granted to convert a building in the countryside.

23.5 The Council also has adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on the ‘Re-use of Agricultural Buildings’ that provides more detailed guidance on these issues.

23.6 The Council’s policies on these issues will need to be reviewed in light of this Government guidance. This raises the following as matters for debate:-

- what uses are appropriate, in principle, to allow for in conversions or replacement buildings in the rural areas?
- what locational criteria should apply and how should this influence the policy approach, e.g. a less restrictive policy in and adjoining villages?
- what is an appropriate scale of re-use?
- how important is the character of unlisted, traditional rural buildings in establishing a policy approach?
- what other factors, if any, need to be incorporated into a new policy?

23.7 In reviewing policies RE5, RE6 and RE7, there are a number of options to change the current policies. The Council could adopt a more flexible policy position on rural building conversions. This could involve a less restrictive approach to residential conversions or allow a wider range of non-residential uses to be permitted. Alternatively, it could seek to be more restrictive on residential conversions by, for example, only supporting them in principle in listed buildings.

23.8 The Council could also review the detailed criteria in the policies so as to allow a wider range of potential uses and scale of operations to take place in converted buildings or, alternatively, it could seek to make the criteria more restrictive.

23.9 Finally, the Council could make a clearer distinction between the scale and nature of uses that are acceptable in conversions that are located within or adjoining a village as opposed to those located in the open countryside.
Should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD:-

F1

In principle, allow a wider range of potential uses to take place in converted buildings in the rural areas? or take a more restrictive approach than current policy?

F2

Continue to allow, in principle, conversions to residential use in non-listed agricultural buildings?

F3

Amend the detailed criteria to allow a more restrictive, or less restrictive, approach to the scale and nature of uses permitted in converted buildings in rural areas?

F4

Take a different approach to the scale and nature of uses permitted in converted buildings in or adjoining villages, to those in the rest of the countryside?

23.10 In reviewing policy RE7, the Council could choose not to specifically replace RE7 and rely on the imposition of a condition to restrict enlargement of converted buildings on a case-by-case basis if necessary.

F5

Should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD, specifically replace policy RE7 and rely on a condition in the appropriate circumstances?

23.11 Village shops play an important local economic role and, by extension, help sustain the wider rural economy. National government guidance endorse this view and seeks to restrict their loss where possible. Currently, policy SH6 of the Local Plan adopts a fairly restrictive approach regarding the loss of village shops, only allowing it to occur when an alternative provision can be met within reasonable walking distance, or it can be demonstrated that the shop is not viable in its current location.
23.12  On the face of it there appears to be two main options available in reviewing policy SH6. This is either to continue the existing approach, or, to alter the criteria of the existing policy so that it is more restrictive, for example by not allowing the loss of village shops, even if other local shops are available.

**F6**

Should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD, continue with existing restrictive policy approach to village shop losses? Or take a more restrictive approach?
24.1 Policy SH5 of the Local Plan seeks to prevent the change of use of shops to A2 uses (e.g. estate agents, banks and building societies) within an identified part of the shopping frontage in Tenterden by limiting the amount of such uses to no more than 20% of one of the sections of primary frontage. This was to ensure that the character of Tenterden’s shopping offer remained attractive.

24.2 Tenterden’s shops are recognised as one of the elements that help to define its image and character and the role that planning policy can play in maintaining or enhancing this is a key issue. A primary frontage policy such as policy SH5 is the most usual way of seeking to achieve this but can sometimes be difficult to justify in commercial terms, particularly if a unit has been vacant for some while.

24.3 The basic options are, therefore, to either retain a primary frontage policy for Tenterden in the new DPD or to deal with proposals for a change of use on an individual basis without a specific policy to rely on. The latter approach may be regarded as more flexible but has the disadvantage of not providing any context on which to judge whether a change of use might be detrimental to the viability of Tenterden’s retail mix.

24.4 If a primary frontage policy is to be retained, the question should then be whether that defined frontage is correct, or whether it should be amended in any way and/or whether the 20% limit embodied in the current policy remains appropriate. If the primary frontage were to be expanded, this could potentially give the protection of the policy to more of Tenterden High Street but could also dilute the effectiveness of the policy by extending it to areas that do not properly justify ‘primary’ frontage status. Similarly, an increase in the 20% limit in the policy could reduce the potential for the loss of shop units but also would require a higher level of justification in order to be effective.

Please choose from one of the following 3 options. Do you feel the Tenterden & Rural Sites DPD should:

G1
Retain a primary shopping frontage policy for Tenterden?

OR

G2
Alter the identified frontage either by making it longer/shorter or altering the 20% limit of the policy?

OR

G3
Remove the primary shopping frontage policy for Tenterden?
25 Issue H - Local landscape designations

25.1 This section relates to Special Landscape Areas (SLA’s) and not Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which are protected at a national level, and this level of protection is continued by policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and in PPS7.

25.2 Policy EN27 of the Local Plan relates to Special Landscape Areas which are County level designations, derived from the Kent and Medway Structure Plan. Ashford Borough includes 5 SLA’s which, combined, cover a considerable rural area of the Borough.

25.3 Emerging government policy on the issue in PPS7 is quite clear and states “the Government believes that carefully drafted, criteria-based policies in LDDs, utilising tools such as landscape character assessment should provide sufficient protection for these areas, without the need for rigid local designations that may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas,” and “local landscape designations should only be maintained, or exceptionally, extended, where it can clearly be shown that criteria-based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection…”

25.4 It appears likely that a criteria-based approach to development in locally important landscapes will be required in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD. This would need to go beyond the current wording in policy EN27 of the Local Plan that clearly gives priority to the conservation or enhancement of natural beauty in SLA’s over other planning considerations. Such criteria would need to be firmly tied to the particular landscape qualities and characteristics in an area and not rely on a ‘blanket’ restrictive approach.

25.5 There are several options to consider here. Firstly, is it reasonable to ask whether there needs to be specific protection for SLA’s that is over and above the usual policies of restraint that apply to development in the countryside? Is there sufficient justification for a policy approach that seeks to provide additional protection to locally designated landscape area?

H1

Should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD retain a policy to specifically cover Special Landscape Areas in the Borough that gives a higher level of protection to the landscape than standard countryside protection policies?

25.6 If the answer to this questions is ‘yes’, then the options available appear to cover whether it is appropriate, through a criteria-based approach, that large areas of the Borough are designated as ‘special landscape’ over and above their ‘countryside’ status or whether the Council should only seek to identify smaller areas, that warrant ‘special’ protection in accordance with landscape character assessments.

H2

If yes, seek to justify the existing Special Landscape Areas as warranting designation on a criteria based approach, or only designate smaller identified areas?
25.7 Finally, should a policy relating to SLA’s continue to prioritise the conservation and enhancement of the landscape above all other planning matters or, should there be equal or greater weighting given to economic or social factors?

**H3**

Should any policy relating to Special Landscape Areas (or their equivalent) continue to prioritise the conservation of the landscape above all other planning considerations? If not, why not?
26 Issue I - Allocation of sites for Gypsies and Travellers

Providing for the Needs of Gypsies and Travellers

26.1 The way in which the planning system deals with the provision of sites for gypsies and travellers is changing. This reflects recent guidance from the Government and is also reflected in emerging planning guidance that will be included in the South East Plan. Essentially it is now a requirement for local authorities to make provision for sites for gypsies and travellers in their LDF documents based on an assessment of their accommodation needs.

26.2 The Borough Council has carried out such an assessment along with other authorities in Kent and has provided that information to the Regional Assembly. The review of the South East Plan that will contain the information on site provision will be published for public consultation later this year. The precise level of provision is not yet known and will be subject to widespread consultation and consideration at a public examination but it is clear from the emerging evidence that the Council will have to allocate some new sites specifically for gypsy and traveller accommodation. The number of sites and their precise location will need to be the subject of further more detailed work but it is obviously important that the issue is raised here as a topic that may have an impact upon the rural area as part of this Issues and Options report.

Provision of sites for gypsies and travellers could potentially be met, at least in part, within the urban area, and/or as part of the proposed major urban extensions to Ashford. However given that Ashford’s rural area currently contains gypsy and travellers sites, and the rural area may be required to accommodate allocations, it is considered prudent to raise the issues within this Report.

If the rural area is considered to be the most appropriate location for additional sites for gypsies and travellers, should the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD:

I1
Focus provision on several smaller sites or just one or two large sites?

I2
Only extend existing gypsy sites?

I3
What factors should the Council consider in deciding upon the location of those sites?
27 Next Steps

27.1 All the comments received on this Issues and Options Report will inform the production of the Tenterden and Rural Sites Draft Submission Document, due to be published in the autumn of this year.

27.2 It is at that stage that the Council will propose which sites it considers to be the most suitable for development in the rural areas and how it believes the detailed rural planning policies raised in this report should be addressed, having taken account of the views expressed in response to this Report and other consultation carried out. Once published, the Draft Submission Document will also be subject to wide public consultation and a subsequent independent examination into its soundness.
1 Existing Local Plan Policies

HG5

Residential development (of five or more dwellings) will not be permitted on sites other than those shown on the Proposals Map, except on ‘windfall’ sites which come forward for development within the confines (*) of Ashford, Tenterden, Charing, Hamstreet and Wye where:

a) the location of the site provides residents with easy opportunities to walk or cycle when travelling to work, school, shopping, community and leisure facilities;

b) it does not result in the displacement of other uses such as employment, leisure or community uses for which there is a need in the area;

c) the proposal does not result in town or village ‘cramming and’ is of good design.

(*) The confines of these settlements are defined as the limits of continuous development (including narrow gaps which may be suitable for infilling by one or two dwellings only) forming the existing built-up area of the settlement.

HG6

Minor development or infilling will be acceptable within the confines of the following towns and villages:

Ashford, Tenterden, Aldington, Appledore, Appledore Heath, Bishopsden, Biddenden, Bilsington, Brabourne Lees, Challock, Charing, Chilham, Egerton, Godmersham, Hamstreet, High Halden, Hothfield, Kenardington, Kingsnorth, Mersham, Newenden, Pluckley (including Pluckley Thorne), Pluckley Station, Rolvenden, Rolvenden Layne, Ruckinge, Shadoxhurst, Smarden, Stone, Warehorne, Wittersham, Woodchurch and Wye; providing that the following requirements are met:

a) the development can easily be integrated into the existing town or village without the need to substantially improve infrastructure or other facilities;

b) the location of the site provides residents with easy opportunities to walk, cycle or use public transport when travelling to local facilities (including schools where they exist) in the town or village;

c) it does not result in the displacement of other uses such as employment, leisure or community uses for which there is a need in the area;

d) the proposal does not result in unacceptable town or village ‘cramming’ and is of good design.
The ‘confines’ of the town or village are defined as the limits of continuous development forming the existing built-up area of the town or village. This definition may, however, include sites suitable for ‘infilling’ which is the completion of an otherwise substantially built-up frontage by the filling of a narrow gap, usually capable of taking one or two dwellings only.

HG7

New residential development outside the confines of an existing village will not be permitted unless it constitutes one of the following:

a) it is an agricultural dwelling, justified under policy RE10;

b) it is a re-use or adaptation of an existing rural building of architectural or historic interest, justified under policy RE6;

c) it is a replacement dwelling or an extension to a dwelling that is justified under policies HG8 and HG9 below;

d) it is a ‘local needs’ scheme on an exception site under policy HG15.

HG15

Proposals specifically designed to meet local housing needs will be permitted on unallocated sites within or adjoining Tenterden and rural settlements as “exceptions” to other policies restraining development, provided that the Council is satisfied that:

a) the local needs exist and cannot otherwise be met, and

b) secure arrangements can be made to reserve the dwellings for eligible local people in perpetuity, and

c) there are no overriding planning objections.

The Council will refuse planning permission for local needs schemes on non-Local Plan sites that rely on cross subsidy from general market housing.

RE1

Proposals to expand existing business premises in Tenterden and the rural areas will be permitted, provided that the following criteria are met:

a) the extension proposed is small-scale in relation to the existing gross floorspace and is to meet the needs of the existing business occupier, except where provision to the contrary is made by a development site policy in this Plan;

b) the development can be integrated sensitively into its context respecting the character of important existing buildings and the local rural environment; and
c) the proposal does not involve an extension to a previously converted building where that building has character that would be seriously affected.

RE2
Proposals which would lead to the loss of existing business sites and premises in Tenterden or the villages will not be permitted, unless:

a) they are replaced with similar facilities elsewhere in the locality; or,

b) the site is not appropriate for the continuation of its present or any other employment use due to a significant detriment to the amenities and environment of neighbouring residents; or,

c) it can be shown that the unit is no longer viable for employment use and that it has remained unsold or unlet for a substantial period of time, despite genuine and sustained attempts to sell or let it on reasonable terms.

RE3
Proposals for the development of new employment buildings and uses will be permitted in Tenterden and the rural areas:

a) on sites shown on the Proposals Map; or,

b) on other sites within the confines of Tenterden and the villages where the character of the settlement is not damaged significantly by the form of development proposed in terms of its layout, building design and scale; the level or type of activity it generates, and the functional and visual relationship it has with adjoining uses.

RE5
Proposals to reuse non-residential buildings in the rural area for a new employment, leisure or non-residential tourist-related use will be permitted where each of the following is met:

a) the building is of permanent and substantial construction and its form, bulk and general design are in keeping with its surroundings;

b) where the building is outside the confines of the villages, it is capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction;

c) the building is capable of conversion in a way which respects the character of the existing building, or group of buildings, and any important existing features;

d) where the existing building has a significant adverse effect on the landscape in terms of visual amenity, the development would secure an improvement to its appearance;
e) the setting of the building would not be damaged by changes associated with the nature of the use proposed;

f) the total floorspace of the building(s) concerned is not so large that their use for the purposes proposed would create large numbers of jobs on sites in rural areas which are poorly served by public transport and relatively remote from other services. The scale of the proposal should not be excessive in relation to the scale of the employment needs of the rural area; and

g) there are no significantly sized office or similar employment uses proposed generating high employee densities likely to generate additional or longer journeys to work, or large scale tourism proposals (i.e. with the potential to attract more than 5,000 visitors per year - see policy TM9).

RE6

Proposals to reuse listed or other traditional agricultural buildings in the rural area which have architectural or historic value for residential use will be permitted where:

a) the building is capable of conversion without complete or substantial reconstruction; and

b) the proposal demonstrates that the special architectural or historic interest of the building will be retained and any external changes do not damage its appearance or architectural integrity, important features of its curtilage or its relationship to any neighbouring buildings and the surrounding landscape.

RE7

When planning permission is granted for the conversion of buildings in the countryside to an alternative use, the local planning authority will impose conditions which remove rights to enlarge, or alter converted property or to erect buildings within their curtilages.

EN27

Long term protection will be given to Special Landscape Areas and other important landscape features. Priority will be given over other planning considerations to the conservation or enhancement of natural beauty, including landscape, wildlife and geological features, while recognising that landscape considerations carry less weight in Special Landscape Areas than in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. At the same time, due regard will be had to the economic and social well-being of the area.

SH5

Within the area of Tenterden town centre indicated on the Proposals Map as forming the primary shopping frontages, changes of use or new development schemes from Class A1 uses to other A2 uses will be permitted provided the A2 uses would not cumulatively amount to more than 20% of the length of the primary frontages within any of the defined sections.
(Note – the identified frontages are from Station Road to East Cross and Webb’s shop to Recreation ground Road)

**SH6**

In local centres and villages, and in the case of individual shops, planning permission will be granted for a change of use from A1 provided:

a) it can be demonstrated that there is alternative provision for a similar type of A1 use within reasonable walking distance (300 metres); or,

b) where it can be shown that the unit is no longer viable for retail purposes and that it has remained unlet for a substantial period of time, despite genuine and sustained attempts to let it on reasonable terms.

**CF16**

Proposals for local community facilities may be permitted as an exception to normal policies of restraint, on sites within or adjoining villages to meet an identified and significant local need, provided that:

a) the service cannot adequately be provided at existing community facilities in the vicinity; and,

b) arrangements are made to ensure that the building is retained for community use in the future.
Tenterden and the Villages

Spatial Objective

- To sustain vital and viable communities in Tenterden and the villages with the larger service centre roles that serve the surrounding smaller villages and countryside.

The role of Rural Area

6.1 The remaining areas outside the Ashford Growth Area are rural in nature. These areas are rich in environmental and landscape quality and protecting and enhancing these characteristics is paramount. However, rural towns and settlements need to be able to grow to sustain themselves. Providing balanced growth opportunities to enable people to live and work in their own rural town or village and the support of local services is a key recurring theme that comes through consultation with rural communities as is the strong desire to retain the qualities of an attractive environment that define the character of the rural settlements. How best to strike this balance is at the heart of a planning strategy for the rural areas.

Growth levels in the rural area

6.2 Based on an extrapolation of the residential targets in policy HP1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan, and consistent with the emerging Regional Guidance, an assumed contribution of 1,500 dwellings over the period 2001-2021 is required from the rest of the Borough outside of the Ashford growth area. These figures are calculated to represent sustainable balanced growth targets for the rural area of the Borough.

6.3 Of this 1,500 figure it is assumed that 700 units will come forward as windfall sites which have not been specifically allocated in the LDF. This figure is derived from examining recent trends in windfalls – typically small infill sites, conversions, etc - coming forward for development which show an average of 35 units per year completed in the rural areas over the past 5 years. It is reasonable to assume this trend will continue and therefore an average assumption of 35 completions per year from windfalls over the whole period 2006-21 would result in 525 new units being created.

6.4 There have also been 143 housing units built on allocated Local Plan sites since 2001. Therefore, the Core Strategy has a residual figure of 655 units left over from the original 2001-2021 target figure of 1500 units remaining to be allocated in the LDF between 2006-2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Housing Requirement 2006 – 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford Rural Area 2001 – 2021 1500 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions - Local Plan allocations 2001-06 143 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions - windfall sites 2001-06 177 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed windfalls at 35 p.a. 2006 - 2021 525 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural residual requirement 2006 - 2021 655 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Settlement Hierarchy Approach
6.5 Rural settlements differ in their scale and their ability to sustain growth. Larger settlements generally offer more service provision as they incorporate more houses, jobs, existing infrastructure, better public transport provision and community facilities. These settlements can provide a critical service centre role for a wider surrounding area and have the ability to accommodate and sustain proportionally higher levels of allocated growth, allowing them to build on their key service centre role.

6.6 PPS7 expands this sustainable planning principle for the rural areas specifically and states that growth in rural areas should be located in or near to local service centres where employment, housing including affordable housing, services and other facilities can be provided close together.

6.7 The Council’s policy approach to the distribution of development in the rural areas in the Core Strategy has three main strands: an updated, reviewed sustainability matrix; an assessment of the potential for a village to act as a local service centre, and an allowance for robustly prepared and articulated local views to shape the policy.

**Sustainability matrix results**

6.8 The sustainability matrix originally used in the Borough Local Plan was reviewed to take account of a wider range of factors in order to give a broader and more robust guide to the relative sustainability of a parish area, and to account for any changes in service provision that may have occurred since the previous survey was undertaken. Although this is a ‘snapshot’, this approach continues to be very useful guide to a settlement’s relative sustainability as a local service centre and its potential to either carry on that role or enhance it. The matrix represents a consistent and objective methodology (see Housing Background Document).

**Role of service centres**

6.9 Whilst larger settlements generally offer more services, some smaller settlements also have a role to play as localised service centres for their immediate surrounding area, particularly if they are relatively remote from a larger village.

**Local Views**

6.10 The Council is pro-active in its approach to community engagement in the planning system and has undertaken several workshops and consultation stages that have helped to shape the Borough’s Community Strategy; engaged with local communities to produce Parish ‘Wish Lists’, Village Design Statements, Parish Plans and other appraisals. The LDF Statement of Community Involvement provides more details of these processes.

6.11 It is important that the rural spatial planning policy balances the wishes of local people and sound planning policy. For example, if a Parish Council reflects through consultation with the Borough Council that they would like small scale allocated development in their settlement, but the settlement does not score well on the sustainability matrix and is not considered a local service centre, then there is a need to demonstrate that there is a justifiable local exceptional planning case relating to that settlement. Such exceptions may relate to a specific local social, community or economic-related issue (this does not refer to the issue of local needs housing).

6.12 Rural local needs housing developments are specifically reserved for people already associated with the locality, usually by residence or work place. Local needs housing is delivered through an ‘exception sites’ policy that permits residential development to occur on sites that would not otherwise be acceptable for such purposes. This approach has delivered 23 rural local needs schemes in the Borough and this is still the preferred way to deliver such sites. Therefore, it is not proposed to make specific site allocations in the LDF for local needs housing and such units should be counted as part of the ‘windfall’ contribution to meeting rural housing targets.

**The proposed settlement hierarchy**
6.13 Within the Borough, Tenterden is by far the largest settlement outside Ashford and its role as an important service centre is well established. Therefore, clearly it should accommodate the highest proportion of allocated growth outside the Ashford Growth Area. After Tenterden, it is consistent with existing Local Plan policy to include Wye, Hamstreet and Charing as a second tier of the settlement hierarchy. These settlements scored very highly on the matrix of sustainability indicators and are considered suitable to continue to accommodate modest residential allocations in the future.

6.14 Although Tenterden, Charing, Hamstreet and Wye could be accorded proportionally higher levels of allocated growth, restricting all the allocated development to these settlements would result in a significant expansion that would be out of scale and potentially damaging to their character. Therefore other settlements need to be considered for allocated development.

6.15 The additional development requirements in the Core Strategy are best achieved by broadening the Local Plan settlement hierarchy with an additional tier, by identifying a number of medium-sized villages that could accommodate a small amount of new development over the LDF period. These are derived from a combination of the outputs of the sustainability matrix and the extent to which they do, or could, play a localised service centre role, as well as the views of the local Parish Council. This tier is fairly broad so as to limit the potential impact on any single settlement.

6.16 Chilham, Biddenden, Bethersden and Woodchurch all scored highly in the sustainability matrix. They also play an important role as a local service centres to the rural areas surrounding them which incorporate numerous small settlements. These identified service centres are identified on the Borough Diagram (Fig.1).

6.17 Aldington is included in the third tier as, although it doesn’t score particularly highly in the sustainability matrix, it does act as a significant local service centre for the rural area in the south-eastern part of the Borough with several smaller settlements surrounding it. In addition, the Parish Council were particularly keen to foster this role and were supportive of the principle of growth.

6.18 Rolvenden and High Halden score reasonably well on the sustainability matrix process and are therefore included. However it is recognised that both these settlements have a smaller local service centre role as the periphery of their surrounding area is already well served - Rolvenden is near to Tenterden and High Halden is relatively close to a number of other service centres, particularly Tenterden, but also Biddenden, Bethersden and Woodchurch.

6.19 Challock and Hothfield have only an average score on the sustainability matrix, but are included as they have indicated a strong desire to have more small scale allocated development beyond just local needs housing in order to address specific local concerns about the continuing vitality of the village. They are therefore worthy of further assessment through the site allocation process. Further consultation regarding the suitability of these settlements for allocated growth as outlined above will be carried out during the production of the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.

**Phasing Approach in the Rural Areas**

6.20 Government policy clearly states the need to manage the release of land for housing properly and monitor the progress of sites closely to ensure that adequate provision is made for new development and that significant over supply situations are avoided. A phased approach ensures there is a properly managed release of land. In addition, demand in the rural settlements is such that a single release of sites would result in pressures for additional land releases beyond the 655 units towards the end of the LDF period. Therefore a two phased release of allocated sites is proposed in policy CS6. The first phase runs from 2006-13 and the second from 2014-2021 to provide a consistent supply across the LDF period.
6.21 This approach allows for a review of the amount of land required for housing in the rural area after the first phase. On a proportionate basis, sufficient land for 310 new housing units will be allocated in phase one.

Employment in the rural settlements

6.22 Rural businesses provide many local jobs and services in villages and the rural area. The rural economy needs to be encouraged and stimulated, whilst also protecting the landscape, the character of rural settlements, the best agricultural land and the nature conservation value of the countryside by taking into account the scale of the proposed development, the quality of the surrounding landscape and the extent to which any serious impacts could be mitigated.

6.23 Tenterden’s role as the key local service centre in the Borough after Ashford means that it has an important economic role for its residents and those in the surrounding settlements. With additional provision to be made for residential development during the LDF period, provision for new small-scale business development (use classes B1-B8) and service industries should also be made within, or adjoining, the built up area of Tenterden. The majority of existing businesses are small scale and proposals for additional small-scale businesses serving local requirements will help to bolster the town’s role. The special character and quality of Tenterden means that employment proposals should not conflict with conservation objectives and protect the town’s special character. Such development should be appropriate in scale to its surroundings and without significant effects on amenity, character and setting of the area.

6.24 Some limited employment development may also be acceptable in or next to other villages where the employment opportunity essentially requires a rural location due to the nature of the business involved, or in order to meet local business and community needs, or to maintain the vitality of these communities. In these circumstances, the Council will weigh the economic benefits of these proposals against any potentially negative environmental or traffic-related impacts. Detailed policy guidance will be brought forward in the Tenterden & Rural Sites DPD.

6.25 Conversely, the loss of business sites and buildings in Tenterden and the villages reduces the prospect of jobs being provided locally. More sustainable patterns of activity rely on reducing potential travel distances and so opportunities for local employment need to be retained. Employment sites are often vulnerable as they generally command higher values if redeveloped for housing. Therefore, in principle, proposals that would result in a net reduction of usable and viable employment space on a site within or adjoining a village should not be permitted. Detailed policy guidance will be brought forward in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.

6.26 The presence of higher education, related research and business at Wye over the years has helped to support a thriving, mixed local community but has also been an important part of Ashford’s wider academic and business offer. Work on generating the jobs needed to support Ashford’s growth role has repeatedly highlighted the importance of further and higher education. This can improve local skills, create a skilled workforce for incoming investors and generate spin-off businesses arising from local research and development. It is crucial that a high quality, knowledge-based presence remains in the Borough at Wye.

POLICY CS6 - THE RURAL SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY

In the Borough outside the Ashford Growth Area, housing site allocations will be made through the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD based on a hierarchy of settlements suitable for limited expansion. Housing allocations will be distributed at the following settlements and within the following periods:
### Phase 2 (2014 - 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenterden</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamstreet</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed between: Aldington, Biddenden, Bethersden, Challock, Chilham, Hothfield, High Halden, Rolvenden and Woodchurch</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land will be allocated within the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD for additional small-scale employment proposals within or adjoining Tenterden and, subject to an assessment of demand, within or adjoining the larger villages.
### 3 List of all other submitted sites

Sites Submitted that fall outside the confines of CS6 Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other01</td>
<td>Land at Steeds Lane Kingsnorth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other02</td>
<td>Briars, Kingsnorth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other03</td>
<td>Whiteholm, Bromley Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other04</td>
<td>Steeds Lane Kingsnorth 83 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other05</td>
<td>Magpie Hall Lane Nr Kingsnorth End. 40 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other06</td>
<td>Kingsnorth, nr Cannon 8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other07</td>
<td>The Ironworks TN26 1NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other08</td>
<td>Taylor Farm site TN23 3ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other09</td>
<td>Woodland in Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other10</td>
<td>Land at Shadoxhurst off Tally Ho Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other11</td>
<td>Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other12</td>
<td>Shadoxhurst behind Tally-Ho Road 40 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other13</td>
<td>Hamstreet Rd, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other14</td>
<td>Woodside, Nickleywood Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other15</td>
<td>Mill House - Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other16</td>
<td>Jenkey Farm Church Lane - Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other17</td>
<td>2.3 hectares land Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other18</td>
<td>Land at Criol Barn, Bethersden Road - Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other19</td>
<td>Copper Lodge Farm, Water Lane, Smarden, Nr Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other20</td>
<td>Mill Lane - Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other21</td>
<td>3 plots in Priory Road, Bilsington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other22</td>
<td>Land South of Chessenden Lane – Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 23</td>
<td>Longwait Title, Vesper Lane - Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other24</td>
<td>Bethersden Road/Biddenden Road in Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other25</td>
<td>Vesper Hawk Farm, Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other26</td>
<td>Land in Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other27</td>
<td>Willesborough Lees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other28</td>
<td>Willesborough Lees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other29</td>
<td>Evegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other30</td>
<td>Land at Calland - Smeeeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 31</td>
<td>Former builders yard, Plain road, Smeeeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other32</td>
<td>May Cottage, Smeeeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 33</td>
<td>Church Road, Smeeeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other34 and 35</td>
<td>2 sites - plot 1 - 21 hectares and plot 2 - 11 hectares, Stocks road, Wittersham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other36</td>
<td>Land at Woodland View - Wittersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other37</td>
<td>Lloyds Farm, Wittersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other38</td>
<td>Land at Egerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other39</td>
<td>Egerton Forstal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other40</td>
<td>Jegrac, Forstal Road, Egerton Forstal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other41</td>
<td>Pembles Oast Farm Egerton Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other42</td>
<td>Pluckley Green, Pluckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other43</td>
<td>Pluckley Brickworks site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other44</td>
<td>Land at Smarden Road, Pluckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other45</td>
<td>Pluckley Station Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other46</td>
<td>Bliby Business Centre, mersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other47</td>
<td>1.5 acres land Glebelands - Mersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other48</td>
<td>Land at Orchard Cottage - Mersham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other49</td>
<td>Land near Church lane - Molash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other50</td>
<td>2 and half acres in Molash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other51</td>
<td>Woodreeve Farm - Ruckinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other52</td>
<td>1.6 acres Bromley Green Road, Nr Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other53</td>
<td>2.25 acre at haffenden Quarter, Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other54</td>
<td>Land in Appledore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other55</td>
<td>Cherry Croft, Kenardington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other56</td>
<td>2 acres between Orchard Lane and East Mountain Lane, Kennington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other57</td>
<td>Old Sawmill, Hastingleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other58</td>
<td>Brackenlea, Warehorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other59</td>
<td>Land north of Chart road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other60</td>
<td>East of Bucksford Manor , Great Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other61</td>
<td>3.7 hectares of land at Stone in Oxney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other62</td>
<td>Land at Sunnybrook Stables, The Street, Brook TN25 5PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other63</td>
<td>Warehorne Road, Warehorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other64</td>
<td>Blackwall Road, South Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other65</td>
<td>Adjacent to Phyllis farm, Old Wives Lees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other66</td>
<td>Land south of court lodge road - Appledore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other67</td>
<td>2 sites in Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other68</td>
<td><em>This site was incorrectly coded</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other69</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Bethersden Rd, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other70</td>
<td>Land &amp; buildings at Clarkswood, Hornash lane, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other71</td>
<td>Land opposite Stumble Woods, Kingsnorth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other72</td>
<td>Land and woodlands adjacent to Bond lane, Kingsnorth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other73</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Magpie Hall rd and Ashford rd, Stubbs Cross Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other74</td>
<td>A28 Great Chart / Bethersden Road 50 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other75</td>
<td>Chilmington area approx 270 acres near to area above (A28 – 50 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other76</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Shottenden lane near Molash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other77</td>
<td>Red willows, priory Road, Aldington Frith, Bilsington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other78</td>
<td>Cranbourne Cottage, Frith Road, Aldington Frith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other79</td>
<td>Land Adj to Hazels, Bromley Green Road, Ruckinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other80</td>
<td>Hogben Farm, Sevington Lane, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other81</td>
<td>Land Adj Sherwood, Bromley Green Road, Upper Ruckinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other82</td>
<td>The Brill, Nickley Wood Road, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other83</td>
<td>Mill House, Church Lane, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other84</td>
<td>Land Surrounding Addington Lodge, Rock Hill Road, Egerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other85</td>
<td>Land at Court Lodge, Appledore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other86</td>
<td>Land at Bliby Wood: comprising of ‘Casa Amica’ and Ripleys Car breakers yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other87</td>
<td>Hedge End and Sarac, Stumble Lane, Kingsnorth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other88</td>
<td>Land at Bromley Green, adj Hamstreet Rd and Bromley Green Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other89</td>
<td>Land at Rook Toll, Boughton Lees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other90</td>
<td>Land North of Kennington Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other91</td>
<td>Bethersden Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other92</td>
<td>Rear of Tally Ho Road and fronting Blingrooms Lane, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other93</td>
<td>Land Fronting Church Lane, Shadoxhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other94</td>
<td>Land at Winser Road, Rolvenden Layne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other95</td>
<td>Pluckley Brick &amp; Tile Works, Pluckley Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other96</td>
<td>Pluckley Station Southside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other97 98 and 99</td>
<td>Land Adjoining recreation Ground in Pluckley Egerton Road, Pluckley Land adj to St. Mary’s Church, Little Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other100</td>
<td>Land Adj to Heath Bungalows, Appledore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other101</td>
<td>Kimberley Farm, Granary Court Road, Brabourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other102</td>
<td>Phyllis Farm, Old Wives Lees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other103</td>
<td>12+Acres on border of Tenterden and Biddenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other104</td>
<td>Site 1 Nats Lane, Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other105</td>
<td>Nats Lane Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other106</td>
<td>Naccolt, Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other07</td>
<td>Site 2 Nats Lane Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other108a and b</td>
<td>Lands at Bromley Green – southeast corner crossroads Hamstreet Rd and Bromley Green Rd intersect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other109</td>
<td>Land 17 acres approx between Ruckinge and Hamstreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other110</td>
<td>1.5 Acres Land at Prior Oast House, Chilham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other111</td>
<td>Land and buildings at East Stour Farm, Canterbury Rd, Chilham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other112</td>
<td>Woodleas Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other113</td>
<td>Camber Bourne Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other114</td>
<td>Land Adj Cranbourne Cottage, Frith Road, Aldington Frith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other115</td>
<td>7.5 Acres Ashford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other116</td>
<td>Little Crampton Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other117</td>
<td>Oaktree Farm buildings, Woodchurch rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other118</td>
<td>Green Trees, Redbrook St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other119</td>
<td>Lotland Farm, Biddenden Rd, St Michaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other120</td>
<td>1.34 acre Castletons Oak, Biddenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other121</td>
<td>Milepost Cottage, Benenden Road, Biddenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other122</td>
<td>WoodlandPark, Biddenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other123</td>
<td>Fernwood, Cranbrook Road, Biddenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other124</td>
<td>Land adjacent to unit 5 – Bethersden business park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other125</td>
<td>Pear Tree Cottage, Ashford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other126 a, b,c and d</td>
<td>Vine Hall Farm, Bethersden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other127</td>
<td>Thornden Road, Rolvenden Layne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other128</td>
<td>Land at Copfield Farm, Hastings Road, Rolvenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other129</td>
<td>Britton Farm, Ram Lane, Hothfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other130</td>
<td>Gladwell Farm, Woodchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other131</td>
<td>8 acres Mayshaves, Woodchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other132</td>
<td>King Farm 100 acres plus two smaller plots 7-8 acres, Woodchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other133</td>
<td>Land Next to Shirkoak Caravan Park, Opposite West Lodge, Bethersden Road, Woodchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other134</td>
<td>Harlakenden Farm buildings, Plurenden Rd, Woodchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other135</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Yew Tree Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other136</td>
<td>Stevenson Brothers Linden garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other137</td>
<td>Cranbrook road, 4.59ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other138</td>
<td>Gables Cottage Farm, Monks Horton Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other139</td>
<td>Cobbs Hill, Old Wives Lees, Chilham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other140</td>
<td>Land opposite junction of Stone Hill Road/New Road, Egerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other141</td>
<td>Land at Charing Heath (Adjoining the Red Lion PH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other142</td>
<td>Viaduct Terrace, Hamstreet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section explains some of the technical terms and abbreviations referred to in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.

**Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB):** An area with a statutory national landscape designation, the primary purpose of which is to conserve and enhance natural beauty. Together with National Parks, AONBs represent the nation’s finest landscapes. AONBs are designated by the Countryside Agency (now Natural England).

**Borough Local Plan (LP):** The Ashford Borough Local Plan was formally adopted by the Borough Council in June 2000. It sets out a framework of plans and policies to guide the development and use of land in the Borough. It is in the process of being replaced by the Local Development Framework.

**Brownfield land:** Another term for Previously Developed Land (PDL).

**Conservation area (CA):** Areas formally identified by local planning authorities for having special architectural or historic interest, which can be subject to stricter planning controls.

**Development Plan Document (DPD):** A key local planning document forming an essential part of the Local Development Framework. DPDs include the Core Strategy, site-specific allocations of land, Area Action Plans (where needed), and the Proposals Map. DPDs form part of the statutory development plan. All DPDs are subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination. Once adopted, development control decisions must be made in accordance with them unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

**Examination in Public (EIP):** The public examination of a Local Development Document by an independent Inspector.

**Greenfield land:** Land, often farmland, that has not previously been developed.

**Historic Park and Garden:** A park or garden designated by English Heritage as being of special historic interest.

**Infrastructure:** A summary term for facilities and services required to support development, including water supply, sewage and waste water treatment, electricity, highways, cycle routes, public transport, health and education services, community facilities, open spaces, parks, sports pitches, play areas, etc.

**Kent and Medway Structure Plan (KMSP):** The Structure Plan for Kent and Medway, jointly produced by Kent County Council and Medway Council, which sets out the strategic planning framework for the protection of the environment, major transport priorities, and the scale, pattern and broad location of new development including provision for new housing and major economic development across Kent and Medway. The plan was adopted in July 2006.

**Key service centre:** A term given to larger rural settlements which provide services such as a bank, village shop or post office used by the wider rural community.

**Listed Building:** A building of special architectural or historic interest. Listed buildings are graded I, II* or II with grade I being the highest. Listing includes the interior as well as the exterior of the building, and any buildings or permanent structures within the curtilage. English Heritage is responsible for designating buildings for listing in England.

**Local Development Document (LDD):** The collective term for documents forming part of the Local Development Framework, which include Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents.
Local Development Framework (LDF): A term used to describe a folder of documents, which includes all the local planning authority's Local Development Documents, including the Core Strategy and other Development Plan Documents, Supplementary Planning Documents, and the Statement of Community Involvement amongst others.

Local Planning Authority (LPA): The local borough or town council. In this case Ashford Borough Council.

Parish Plan: A Government-sponsored initiative aimed at improving rural communities, where a plan is developed by the local community setting out what the community and Parish Council should work on in the next few years. Several parishes in Ashford have produced their own Parish Plans.

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG): A series of documents issued by central government setting out national land use policies for England on different areas of planning. These are gradually being replaced by Planning Policy Statements (PPS).

Planning Policy Statements (PPS): A series of statements issued by central government to replace the existing Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) notes.

Previously Developed Land (PDL): Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings) and associated fixed-surface infrastructure. The definition applies to the curtilage of the development. A detailed definition can be found in PPG3.

Regional Planning Guidance (RPG): A document issued by the Government providing strategic planning guidance for each region in England. The current RPG for South East England was adopted in 2001 and amended in 2004 and is referred to as RPG9. As part of the national planning reform process, RPGs are being replaced by Regional Spatial Strategies.

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS): The replacement for Regional Planning Guidance. The RSS identifies the scale and distribution of new housing in the region, indicates areas for regeneration, expansion or sub-regional planning and specifies priorities for the environment, transport, infrastructure, economic development, agriculture, minerals and waste treatment and disposal. The draft RSS for the South East is the South East Plan. Until the South East Plan is adopted, RPG9 forms the RSS for the region.

Section 106 Agreement: A legal agreement under section 106 of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act. S106 agreements are legal agreements between a planning authority and a developer, or undertakings offered unilaterally by a developer, that ensure that certain extra works related to a development are undertaken.

Special Landscape Area (SLA) A local, non-statutory designation protecting areas with higher quality, locally distinctive landscapes.

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI): A key document within the Local Development Framework prepared by the Council, which sets out how the local community and stakeholders will be involved in the preparation of LDF documents. It also sets out arrangements for involving the community when considering planning applications and major proposals for developments.

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): The equivalent of a Supplementary Planning Document under the old Local Plan system.

Village Design Statement (VDS): A Countryside Agency initiative where local communities can influence the design of new development locally by identifying, describing and analysing local character and drawing guidance directly from this character. Several villages in Ashford have produced Village Design Statements.
**Windfall:** A site, usually for housing, which is not specifically allocated for development in a development plan, but comes forward for development during the lifetime of the plan.