
Preferred Options - Development Land Allocations: Housing Annex H - Rejected Housing Sites

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
ANNEX H: CARPENTERS LANE, HADLOW - REJECTED HOUSING SITE				
6. HOUSE BUILDER				
134	Rydon Homes	PO/134.06	Object to Paragraphs 2.3.2, 3.6.5, 3.6.11, 3.7.20, Annex H. Proposal does not comply with PPG2 paragraph 2.8 or 2.9. The site should be kept to meet affordable housing needs in Hadlow. The site should be either left without notation, be included in policy CP7 and added to safeguarded land, or allocated for housing.	Whether this site is returned to green belt, identified as safeguarded land, or firmly allocated, does not affect the outcome which is that the site will only be developed if there is a local need for affordable housing. In the light of Council's decision on the wider strategy for affordable housing it has been decided to return this site to the Green Belt. Any proposal for affordable housing on this site will be considered under the exception sites policy.
ANNEX H: CHEQUERS FARM, TONBRIDGE ROAD, HILDENBOROUGH - REJECTED HOUSING SITE				
3. INTEREST GROUP				
52	Hildenborough Village Preservation Association	PO/052.11	Strongly oppose housing development on Chequers Farm (Map Ref. 37.1)) and therefore support the Council's position..	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
ANNEX H: EAST MALLING RESEARCH STATION, WEST OF KILN BARN ROAD, DITTON - REJECTED HOUSING SITE				
2. PARISH COUNCIL				
268	Ditton Parish Council	PO/268.03	Development of the site for housing would create traffic problems and therefore support the Council's position..	Noted.
ANNEX H: EAST OF FIELDS LANE AND SOUTH OF TONBRIDGE ROAD, WATERINGBURY - REJECTED HOUSING SITE				
3. INTEREST GROUP				
272	Wateringbury Residents' Association (Friends of Wateringbury)	PO/272.03	Support rejection of housing site east of Fields Lane and south of Tonbridge Road, Wateringbury.	Noted.
ANNEX H: EAST OF RIDING LANE, HILDENBOROUGH - REJECTED HOUSING SITE				
3. INTEREST GROUP				
52	Hildenborough Village Preservation Association	PO/052.12	Strongly oppose housing development on the site east of Riding Lane (Map Ref 15.1) and therefore support the Council's position.	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
ANNEX H: ORPINES, WATERINGBURY - REJECTED HOUSING SITE				
3. INTEREST GROUP				
272	Wateringbury Residents' Association (Friends of Wateringbury)	PO/272.02	Support rejection of housing site at the Orpines, Wateringbury.	Noted.
5. LAND OWNER				
128	Orpines Limited	PO/128.02	The site at Orpines, Wateringbury should be identified as a firm housing allocation.	This greenfield site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt in an important gap between Wateringbury and Teston. Background studies for the Kent and Medway Structure Plan have concluded that there is no strategic need for a review of Green Belt boundaries in order to provide additional land for open market housing. The majority of the Borough's housing needs can be met on sites outside the Green Belt. Any proposals for affordable housing on this site will be considered on their merits under the exception sites policy. There is no justification for the inclusion of this site as a housing allocation.

ANNEX H: PRESTON HALL, AYLESFORD - REJECTED HOUSING SITE

1. OFFICIAL CONSULTEE

75	Kent & Medway NHS Strategic Health	PO/075.02	Objection relates to the rejection of the housing sites marked 5.1 on Map H3 at Preston Hall, Aylesford for the following reasons:- * The NHS does not have a need to retain this land for its use.	The site at Preston Hall and Royal British Legion Village is being put forward as being suitable for a master plan approach. This now includes part of the areas previously rejected for housing and marked 5.1 on Map H3 but excludes areas contained within the
----	------------------------------------	-----------	--	---

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
	Authority		<p>* It wishes all of its land (i.e. that shown in Map E1 and Map H3 (5.1)) to be treated together in terms of its disposal and development planning, and this is a requirement of the Secretary of State.</p> <p>This objection has subsequently been amplified by the submission of a master plan for all of the land within the ownership of the Health Authority and Royal British Legion.</p>	Strategic Gap. It is considered important to retain the Strategic Gap designation to maintain the physical separation between the Medway Gap and Maidstone. This would not affect any disposal of NHS land.

ANNEX H: PRIORY WORKS, FIVE OAK GREEN ROAD, TONBRIDGE - REJECTED HOUSING SITE

5. LAND OWNER

59	United Utilities Plc	PO/059.03	<p>Regarding the rejection of the site known as Priory Works for housing purposes. Annex H fails to have regard to the site conditions and the potential for a mixed use scheme and thus lacks the flexibility for the release of appropriate employment land given the over-riding need for housing in the south-east.</p> <p>At the Issues Report stage the Council acknowledged the potential for a possible mixed use scheme. Notwithstanding past planning permissions for B1, B2 and B8 uses, such development has not been forthcoming. The Drivers Jonas study acknowledges a number of site constraints, and also concluded that in quantitative terms, industrial requirements are forecast to decline over the plan period to 2016. It seems unlikely the remainder of the site will come forward for industrial development. The site should therefore be allocated for a mixed use scheme including housing.</p>	<p>The conclusion of the Employment Land Review (ELR) undertaken by Drivers Jonas (July 2005) was that the site west of Woodgate Way, Tonbridge should be retained for employment purposes. The Executive Summary states 'the sites represent an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment to provide for new high quality employment development in Tonbridge, enhancing the relatively limited supply of available land for new development in the local area.' It further states 'These sites could be particularly attractive for manufacturing and warehousing uses, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes.' The ELR was undertaken in accordance with the ODPM advice (December 2004).</p> <p>Given the fact that there is already more than enough housing land potentially available to meet anticipated housing requirements up to 2021 and taking into consideration the conclusions of the ELR there is no justifiable case for allocating the site known as Priory Works for housing.</p>
59	United Utilities Plc	PO/059.02	<p>Relating to paragraph 4.2.7. Object to the rejection of the site known as Priory Works for housing purposes. Annex H fails to have regard to the site conditions and the potential for a mixed</p>	<p>The conclusion of the Employment Land Review (ELR) undertaken by Drivers Jonas (July 2005) was that the site west of Woodgate Way, Tonbridge should be retained for employment</p>

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
			<p>use scheme and thus lacks the flexibility for the release of appropriate employment land given the over-riding need for housing in the south-east.</p> <p>At the Issues Report stage the Council acknowledge the potential for a possible mixed use scheme. Notwithstanding past planning permissions for B1, B2 and B8 uses, such development has not been forthcoming. The Drivers Jonas study acknowledges a number of site constraints, and also concluded that in quantitative terms, industrial requirements are forecast to decline over the plan period to 2016. It seems unlikely the remainder of the site will come forward for industrial development. The site should therefore be allocated for a mixed use scheme including housing.</p>	<p>purposes. The Executive Summary states 'the sites represent an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment to provide for new high quality employment development in Tonbridge, enhancing the relatively limited supply of available land for new development in the local area.' It further states 'These sites could be particularly attractive for manufacturing and warehousing uses, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes.' The ELR was undertaken in accordance with the ODPM advice (December 2004).</p> <p>Given the fact that there is already more than enough housing land potentially available to meet anticipated housing requirements up to 2021 and taking into consideration the conclusions of the ELR there is no justifiable case for allocating the site known as Priory Works for housing.</p>
6. HOUSE BUILDER				
61	Charles Church South East Ltd and United Utilites Plc	PO/061.01	<p>Object to the rejection of the site known as Priory Works for housing purposes. Annex H fails to have regard to the site conditions and the potential for a mixed use scheme and thus lacks the flexibility for the release of appropriate employment land given the over-riding need for housing in the south-east.</p> <p>At the Issues Report stage the Council acknowledge the potential for a possible mixed use scheme. Notwithstanding past planning permissions for B1, B2 and B8 uses, such development has not been forthcoming. The Drivers Jonas study acknowledges a number of site constraints, and also concluded that in quantitative terms, industrial requirements are forecast to decline over the plan period to 2016. It seems unlikely the remainder of the site will come forward for industrial development. The site should therefore be allocated for a mixed use scheme including housing.</p>	<p>The conclusion of the Employment Land Review (ELR) undertaken by Drivers Jonas (July 2005) was that the site west of Woodgate Way, Tonbridge should be retained for employment purposes. The Executive Summary states 'the sites represent an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment to provide for new high quality employment development in Tonbridge, enhancing the relatively limited supply of available land for new development in the local area.' It further states 'These sites could be particularly attractive for manufacturing and warehousing uses, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes.' The ELR was undertaken in accordance with the ODPM advice (December 2004).</p> <p>Given the fact that there is already more than enough housing land potentially available to meet anticipated housing requirements up to 2021 and taking into consideration the conclusions of the ELR there is no justifiable case for allocating the site known as Priory Works for housing.</p>
61	Charles Church South	PO/061.04	<p>Object to Paragraph 4.2.7 in respect of the allocation of the site known as Priory Works for housing purposes. It fails to</p>	<p>The conclusion of the Employment Land Review (ELR) undertaken by Drivers Jonas (July 2005) was that the site west of</p>

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
	East Ltd and United Utilites Plc		<p>have regard to the site conditions and the potential for a mixed use scheme and thus lacks flexibility for the potential release of some of the employment land given the over-riding need for housing in the south-east.</p> <p>At the Issues Report stage the Council acknowledged the potential for a possible mixed use scheme. Notwithstanding past planning permissions for B1, B2 and B8 uses, such development has not been forthcoming. The Drivers Jonas study acknowledges a number of site constraints, and also concluded that in quantitative terms, industrial requirements are forecast to decline over the plan period to 2016. It seems unlikely the remainder of the site will come forward for industrial development. The site should be allocated for a mixed use scheme including housing.</p>	<p>Woodgate Way, Tonbridge should be retained for employment purposes. The Executive Summary states 'the sites represent an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment to provide for new high quality employment development in Tonbridge, enhancing the relatively limited supply of available land for new development in the local area.' It further states 'These sites could be particularly attractive for manufacturing and warehousing uses, capable of accommodating a range of unit sizes.' The ELR was undertaken in accordance with the ODPM advice (December 2004).</p> <p>Given the fact that there is already more than enough housing land potentially available to meet anticipated housing requirements up to 2021 and taking into consideration the conclusions of the ELR there is no justifiable case for allocating the site known as Priory Works for housing.</p>
7. PUBLIC				
282	Mr Tim Lynch	PO/282.04	<p>Support the rejection of this site fro housing. It is poorly served by public transport and a considerable distance from the town centre. An industrial only development would be preferable unless steps can be taken to integrate any residential development better with existing residential areas.</p>	<p>Noted. The site is due to be retained for employment purposes.</p>

ANNEX H: THE FREEHOLD, HADLOW - REJECTED HOUSING SITE

7. PUBLIC				
108	Residents of The Freehold	PO/108.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
176	Mr Jason Rutherford	PO/176.01	<p>Evidence indicates it is unlikely the island site at the Freehold will be confirmed as a village green.</p> <p>The site is wholly within the built up confines of the village can accommodate between 5 and 10 dwellings in accordance with PPS1 and PPG3. The site is sustainable, in an appropriate location, and the corner site is immediately available for affordable housing. To reject it is in direct conflict with central government housing philosophy, adopted planning policy and development control.</p>	<p>The Freehold has historical associations with this part of Hadlow and makes an important contribution to the character of the area. The site should therefore not be identified for housing, for historic and environmental reasons. When the Environmental Protection DPD is prepared consideration will be given to identifying the site as an Important Green Space.</p>
188	Mr Dennis Whitehorne	PO/188.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
189	Mrs Alison Whitehorne	PO/189.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
192	Mr Mark Timmins	PO/192.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
193	Mr Tony Wright	PO/193.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and</p>	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
194	Ms Jacqueline Jones	PO/194.01	community facilities, and open space (policy CP2). *The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).	Noted.
195	Mr Lewis Wright	PO/195.01	*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2). *The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).	Noted.
196	Mr John Richies	PO/196.01	*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2). *The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).	Noted.
197	Ms Jovita Charlwood	PO/197.01	*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2). *The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).	Noted.
198	Ms Alice Chapman-Hatchett	PO/198.01	*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2). *The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).	Noted.
199	Ms Alison	PO/199.01	*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
	Winn		1.7.4). *Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).	
200	Mrs Michelle Heffernan	PO/200.01	*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4). *Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).	Noted.
201	Ms Tracey Richards	PO/201.01	*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4). *Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).	Noted.
202	Mr Russell Battell	PO/202.01	*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4). *Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).	Noted.
203	Ms Janine Allen	PO/203.01	*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4). *Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).	Noted.
204	Ms Lynda Jane Richards	PO/204.01	*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4). *Agree that development should be concentrated on previously	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
205	Mr Paul Richards	PO/205.01	<p>developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p> <p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
206	Mr John Parkin	PO/206.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
207	Ms Catherine Barrett	PO/207.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
208	Mr Michael Hall & Mrs Sylvia Finn	PO/208.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
209	Ms Louise Powell	PO/209.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
210	Ms Anna Lambert-Knott	PO/210.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
211	Mr Nigel Roberts	PO/211.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
212	Mr Thomas Belcher	PO/212.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
213	Mr Robert Homewood	PO/213.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
214	Mrs E A Davies	PO/214.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
215	Mr Andy Joals	PO/215.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p>	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
216	Ms Trudy Hurdle	PO/216.01	<p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p> <p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p>	Noted.
217	Ms Elaine Allen-Ross	PO/217.01	<p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p> <p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p>	Noted.
231	Mr Roger Jenner	PO/231.01	<p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p> <p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p>	Noted.
246	Mr Alan Edbrooke	PO/246.01	<p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p> <p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p>	Noted.
267	Ms Mandy Davison	PO/267.01	<p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p> <p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.

DEVELOPMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS: HOUSING, ANNEX H - REJECTED HOUSING SITES

REF	RESPONDENT	REP	REPRESENTATION	RESPONSE
270	Mrs Sandra Elaine Davies	PO/270.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
274	Mr John Davies	PO/274.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.
290	Ms Karen Coffey	PO/290.01	<p>*The site should be retained as public open space (paragraph 1.7.4).</p> <p>*Agree that development should be concentrated on previously developed land and that there should be regard to social and community facilities, and open space (policy CP2).</p>	Noted.

ANNEX H: WEST OF CROUCH LANE, BOROUGH GREEN - REJECTED HOUSING SITE

7. PUBLIC

142	Mrs Diane Richards	PO/142.01	Fully support the Council's decision to reject planning development on the Crouch Lane site. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty and a quiet country lane that would not withstand an increase in traffic.	Noted.
-----	--------------------	-----------	--	--------