
Preferred Options - Development Land Allocations: Safeguarding Annex L - Safeguarded Sites

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: SAFEGUARDING, ANNEX L - SAFEGUARDED SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
-----	------------	-----	----------------	----------

ANNEX L: A21 TONBRIDGE TO PEMBURY DUALLING - EXISTING SAFEGUARDING SITE

1. OFFICIAL CONSULTEE

69	Highways Agency	PO/069.23	Supports the safeguarding of land for the A21 Tonbridge to Pembury Dualling Scheme which should be retained.	Noted.
----	-----------------	-----------	--	--------

ANNEX L: A227 (A25) BOROUGH GREEN AND PLATT BYPASS - NEW ROAD - EXISTING SAFEGUARDING SITE

5. LAND OWNER

107	H & H Celcon Limited	PO/107.19	Support safeguarding of the Bypass. Table should refer to reliance upon enabling development to fund the provision of the Bypass.	Support Noted. How and when safeguarded highway schemes are funded is primarily a matter for Kent County Council, as Highways Authority, through the Local Transport Plan for Kent, not the Local Development Framework for Tonbridge and Malling Borough. It is not the focus of the LDF to find financial solutions for approved schemes but to deliver a balanced spatial strategy that addresses the social, economic and environmental issues affecting the Borough and community of Tonbridge and Malling.
-----	----------------------	-----------	---	--

ANNEX L: BARMING CAR PARK EXTENSION - EXISTING SAFEGUARDING SITE

6. HOUSE BUILDER

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: SAFEGUARDING, ANNEX L - SAFEGUARDED SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
171	Croudace Homes Ltd	PO/171.10	Regarding deletion of safeguarded land at Barming Railway Station as outlined in Annex L. Land should continue to be safeguarded to extend the station carpark to meet community needs. Whilst Network Rail has no proposal to extend the car park at Barming in the present term, failure to safeguard this land might prejudice the implementation of the proposal in the future.	The Barming car park extension is proposed for deletion as a safeguarded site because Network Rail has no proposal to extend the car park. If there is no certainty that the extension will take place during the lifetime of the LDF plan period then it is unrealistic to continue safeguarding the site. Any proposal that comes forward during the lifetime of the plan will be treated on its merits in the light of Government advice and other policies in the various DPDs.

ANNEX L: BURHAM RESERVOIR EXTENSION - EXISTING SAFEGUARDING SITE

1. OFFICIAL CONSULTEE

65	Southern Water	PO/065.09	Support safeguarding of land to facilitate an extension to Burham Reservoir at a future date, which is consistent with Policy CP33.	Noted.
----	----------------	-----------	---	--------

ANNEX L: PETERS PIT COURT ROAD - NEW ROAD/IMPROVED ROAD - EXISTING SAFEGUARDING SITE

7. PUBLIC

222	Miss Gill Goode	PO/222.03	<p>Concerned about Map L2 and paragraph 4.6.5 regarding the new alignment of the access road to Peters Pit from the new Medway Bridge for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The alignment contradicts CP8 and CP9 regarding maintenance of the Strategic Gap. * The road would be closer to Wouldham and highly visible from Wouldham Recreation Ground * The road would use prime agricultural land and enter a SNCI along the Riverbank. <p>As planning consent has not yet been forthcoming the road alignment should be amended in the LDF.</p>	Planning permission has been granted for the development of Peters Pit including this road link. All of these matters were considered in making that decision.
-----	-----------------	-----------	--	--

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: SAFEGUARDING, ANNEX L - SAFEGUARDED SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
ANNEX L: xx GENERAL xx				
3. INTEREST GROUP				
174	Kent County Council Property Group	PO/174.05	Land reservations should be for "educational and community use" or "education or such other community use to provide a sustainable community". This is because services may alter over a period of time e.g. children's services co-locating to deliver after school clubs, health and social facilities.	This relates to the sites identified for schools in Annex L. It is considered that the references should be changed to "education and community use" to reflect the dual use of school sites and changing circumstances.
ANNEX L: xx NEW xx				
1. OFFICIAL CONSULTEE				
69	Highways Agency	PO/069.24	Support the M20 Junction 4 Section 278 Scheme, which is also in the Highway Agency's Targeted Programme of Improvements, is due to start construction in 2006.	Noted. This proposal should not be included because it will be completed by the adoption of the LDF.
6. HOUSE BUILDER				
171	Croudace Homes Ltd	PO/171.13	Insert Map L7 in Annex L to safeguard land for a roundabout at Hermitage Lane.	Support noted. It is not appropriate to safeguard land in the Development Land Allocations DPD for an unadopted highway scheme associated with a proposal that does not yet have planning permission and where the Borough Council is not the planning authority for the development. Furthermore, Maidstone Borough Council (MBC) has resolved not to release Local Plan allocated greenfield sites. This decision was made in the light of PPG3 'Housing' and MBC's Urban Capacity Study (2002) which found that the Council has the ability to meet its housing provisions on identified brownfield sites. For this reason it would be premature to safeguard land for a roundabout to serve a site where there is uncertainty over its release for development. In any case it is not necessary to safeguard a road improvement that can

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: SAFEGUARDING, ANNEX L - SAFEGUARDED SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
171	Croudace Homes Ltd	PO/171.12	Propose insertion of Map 3 in Annex L to safeguard land at the railway station for an extension to the car park alongside a new small-scale office development.	<p>take place entirely on land within highway limits or on land controlled by the applicant in an area where no other prejudicial development would be permitted. Adequate provisions are made in the Maidstone Borough-wide Local Plan (December 2000) to address the access and highways issues associated with the housing allocation at land east of Hermitage Lane, Maidstone in policies H11, T3, T8 and T23 which itself will be the subject of review through the Maidstone LDF process. Any proposal for the development of this site will be judged in the light of the prevailing policies, Government advice and consultation with Kent County Council as the Highway Authority.</p> <p>The Barming car park extension is proposed for deletion as a safeguarded site because Network Rail has no proposal to extend the car park. If there is no certainty that the extension will take place during the lifetime of the LDF plan period then it is unrealistic to continue safeguarding the site. Any proposal that comes forward during the lifetime of the plan will be treated on its merits in the light of Government advice and other policies in the various DPDs.</p>