

| Respondent ID | Agent ID | Document Part Name | Comment (plain text)   | TMBC Response  |
|---------------|----------|--------------------|--|--|
| 42213665      |          | 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8  | The Green Belt should be protected despite the factors identified. Proposed development within it should be assessed on a case-by-case basis considering the aggregate effect of all such proposals.   | Comment Noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.  |
| 42330785      |          | 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8  | I am deeply concerned that the present prime minister has said she is minded to relax planning laws and fear for our countryside   | Comment Noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.  |
| 25349153      |          | 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8  | Neither the Green Belt - Exceptional Circumstances document nor this section addresses the need to extend the Green Belt as proposed in the withdrawn Local Plan.<br>Loss of green field sites will further reduce biodiversity, but developers know how to get around greenbelt planning, so don't incentivise this (e.g. the Oakhill development in Hildenborough by Berkeley Homes employed specialist planners who boast on their websites about how to work around greenbelt planning rules.)<br>For Hildenborough Parish:<br>Stop additional housing on greenbelt and green field sites. | Comment Noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the next Regulation 18 Document.<br>Comments Noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. RE: Hildenborough Parish: This matter will be considered and reflected within the next Regulation 18 Document. |
| 25314625      |          | 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8  | I think existing planning approvals which have not yet been built out should also be taken into consideration before Green Belt is built on.   | Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.  |
| 42590561      |          | 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8  | With over 70% of the Borough lying within the Green Belt, more needs to be made of appropriate sites within it, in order to help meet its development needs, where such development would not undermine the functions of the Green Belt.<br>There is brownfield previously developed land that is lying derelict with the Green Belt, which should be allocated for development first, rather than the Council simply turning to green fields (unusually also involving a corresponding loss of agricultural land).  | Comments noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.   |
| 42606657      | 42606113 | 5.11.1 - 5.11.8    | The options being put forward in the Reg 18 draft on how to accommodate future development, does not even allow for this.  |  |
| 25349153      |          | 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8  | This section seems to ignore the possibility of demonstrating exceptional circumstances to extend the Green Belt (which I give in relation to the east of West Malling in my response to question 42).   | Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.  |

|          |                      |  |   |
|----------|----------------------|--|---|
| 25349153 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>I strongly support the expansion of the Green Belt to the east as far as Wateringbury Road, East Malling. In the withdrawn Local Plan, TMBC first proposed an extension only as far as the A228 West Malling bypass in the previous Reg 18 Plan, but the overwhelming public response for a further extension eastwards resulted in TMBC including the extension to Wateringbury Road, East Malling in the (now withdrawn) Local Plan.</p> <p>When considered against the five tests in the Framework, this extension to the Green Belt would:</p> <p>a) check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – the designation of this area will aid in preventing the outward spread of West Malling and the southern spread of Leybourne and East Malling from the east. It will also aid in preventing the northern and eastern spread of Kings Hill towards East Malling and Mill Street;</p> <p>b) prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another – the designation of this area will aid in the prevention of West Malling merging across the A228 with Leybourne to the north and with Kings Hill to the south. The present gap, particular to Leybourne at the closer points, is narrow and therefore vulnerable. It will also aid in the prevention of Kings Hill merging with East Malling/Mill Street to the north;</p> <p>c) assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – the designation of this area will prevent encroachment, whether by an extension of an existing settlement or sporadic isolated development of sites. To the west of the A228, it would also complement the existing designation of some of this area as a country park; to the east of the A228, it would safeguard the future of the arable fields on the south side of the A20. The southern part of this area closer to the railway line, being more remote from the A20 is very rural in character and so any change would be more acute;</p> <p>d) preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – the designation will protect the eastern setting of West Malling and its special historic character. Preventing development here for this reason was recognised in the appeal decision on Lavenders Road; and the designation will contribute to the protection of the wider eastern setting of West Malling and its special historic character, together with the western setting of East Malling. Protection of this area will also preserve the setting of historic Clare House, its Park and its wider curtilage; and the setting of the Mill Street and New Barns and Broadwater Farm Conservation Areas;</p> <p>e) assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land – the designation of this area will mean that developers will need to focus on brownfield land rather than development of greenfield land and the countryside.</p> | Comments noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.  |
| 39011745 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>In the previous (withdrawn) local plan, there seemed to be the intention to balance declassification of green belt around Tonbridge with classification of green belt around Kings Hill. This balance seems appropriate, given the risks to the area in terms of over-development and impact on visual amenity for AONBs, and meeting the Government's guidance with regards to the uplift due to high house price / earnings ratio in the borough.</p>   | Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.   |
| 42799649 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>Please continue to protect the green belt. Kent is supposed to be the Garden of England, don't turn it into the car park.</p> <p>The 'exceptional circumstances' needed to justify any large scale development which would substantially affect the MGB and cause it to be removed or changed would need to be truly exceptional and thoroughly evidenced and justified to have any validity. The difficulties of achieving the present Nationally imposed housing target would not justify in the eyes of local voters the building of large scale development in the MGB. Probably only developers themselves and those who stood to gain personally from such a decision would approve.</p>  | <p>Comment Noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p> <p>Comment Noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p> |
| 42806945 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>Any losses to green belt where required for critical national priorities should be made up for by adding additional areas into green belt protection.</p>   | Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.   |
| 42824065 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>Any losses to green belt where required for critical national priorities should be made up for by adding additional areas into green belt protection.</p>   | Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.   |

Green Belt

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

1.2.61 Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

1.2.62 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

1.2.63 Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

1.2.64 Considering these parameters, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sq.m (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period. Furthermore,

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43309729 25240577 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

1.2.66 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- (a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development;
- (b) case law
- (c) Housing Market Areas
- (d) housing affordability
- (e) policy and environmental constraints
- (f) assessed development needs
- (g) housing supply
- (h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.2.67 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. The most obvious omission is delivery.

1.2.68 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

1.2.69 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 4no. residential dwellings and associated private amenity space, landscaping and parking at Allingham Close (Phase II), Borough Green.

1.2.70 The scheme would deliver 2no. 2-bed terraced houses and 2no. 3-bed end-terraced new homes.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

5.11.1 -

43309729 25240577 5.11.8

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

1.2.58 Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

1.2.59 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

1.2.60 Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

'planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent'.

1.2.61 Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sqm (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period.

Furthermore, the Council's Green Belt Assessment prepared by Arup also confirms that TMBC does have a good

- \* People would not countenance building on Hampstead Heath or Greenwich Park, just as they should not countenance building on Greenbelt around Tonbridge and Hildenborough.
- \* Greenbelt was set up to protect the environment and the associated built environment, not to be used as offset or bargaining with other brownfield land on the basis of profit for an individual.
- \* Greenbelt needs to be sustained to provide biodiversity and agriculture, to support self-reliance on food production.
- \* Land for planning for house building should be granted on need and availability while considering stress on local services eg roads, schools and doctors/healthcare.
- \* Other existing brownfield or unutilised commercial property must be used for housing, such as the empty Beales site in Tonbridge or low productivity charity shops (- you can give to charity in other ways).
- \* Local Plan and Councillors have a duty to protect Greenbelt.

After looking through the local plan i am concerned that our lovely rural communities will be turned into one big housing estate.

The need for housing is a bad excuse for building on green belt. New homes in the area are never affordable for local young people and I know for a fact are being bought by people from London and other out of county areas. Therefore i do not want any green belt land to be built on. Any new homes also need to be reserved for local people if you have any hope of alleviating the area's housing need.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43311521 25240577 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

43311969 0 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

43312737 0 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Question 40, 41 & 42

To me, altering the definition of green belt is what adjusting the boundaries means. This seems like manipulating the records to alter the statistics and is not about planning but directly related to the optics of venture and the potential political fall out. I object but I am less concerned about how it looks than the real concern about losing a major amenity which forms a large part of the Kings Hill Community.

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43313313

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

1.2.57 Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities.

However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

1.2.58 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

1.2.59 Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

'Planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

(i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important)

(ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development

(iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43395937

25240577 5.11.1 -  
5.11.8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

1.2.61 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be considered when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

(a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development

(b) case law

(c) Housing Market Areas

(d) housing affordability

(e) policy and environmental constraints

(f) assessed development needs

(g) housing supply The

(h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.2.62 Fundamentally we agree that all these matters should be considered when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. However, the most obvious omission is delivery.

1.2.63 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

5.11.1 -  
43395937 25240577 5.11.8

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

1.2.58 Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

1.2.59 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

1.2.60 Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving

5.11.1 -

43397313 25240577 5.11.8

GREEN BELT

The first stage has concluded that there are exceptional circumstances at strategic level which justify the alteration of the GREEN BELT boundaries

THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. There can never be any circumstances which should allow housing on a GREEN BELT site.

Q 41 There is ample land that is not GREEN BELT that should be built on first. Most of that is Greenfield that provides non-coalescence of settlement, and all is crucial for our food security. We end up with plenty of housing, but we all starve.

5.11.1 -

43417889 0 5.11.8

Q 42 We need to extend the outer boundary of the GREEN BELT not encroach upon it.

Q 43 We need to protect the greenfield sites.

Furthermore, land proposed in the plan is farmed arable and green belt land - which our new prime minister has vowed to protect (saying “we must protect our green belt and we are adopting a “brownfield first” strategy.”) And I agree that we cannot put our housing over the very landscape we build it on.

People would not stand for this if we were in the Lake District or the Cotswolds so why should they stand for building on green belt in Tonbridge and Hildenborough.

Green belt is set to protect the environment and our beautiful and unique nature and not for us to build on.

I believe that more care should be taken in regards to planning permission - facilities and the environment as well as many other impacts should be taken carefully into account.

5.11.1 -

43419585 0 5.11.8

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.



\* At the time of the now withdrawn plan the first proposals were to extend the Green Belt eastwards in this area out to the A228 so that all of West Malling Town would be within the Green Belt boundary. Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is commissioning further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.

\* The current boundary follows the line of what is now the A228 so it cuts through the town. At that time the West Malling by pass now part of the A228 route did not exist so it could not be used as a feature to follow. An extension out to that line would mean that the whole of West Malling conservation area would be within the Green Belt and it would preserve the setting of the town. It would also provide a clear boundary that exists on the ground and one that is permanent. This would accord with the idea that the Green Belt should be a long term designation. The present boundary with parts of the Town within the Green Belt and others excluded does not make sense...It would also encompass manor Park Country Park which is part and parcel of the Town and help keep a green separation between the Town and the built-up part of Leybourne. And it would include Eden Farm so protecting the setting of Malling Abbey in accordance with two recent planning appeal decisions.

\* However, in response to those proposals this parish council and others argued for a further extension of the Green Belt eastwards so as to prevent the coalescence of East Malling and West Malling and also with an expanded Kings Hill.

\* This was accepted and the then draft plan broadly extended the Green Belt out to Wateringbury Road, East Malling and up to what was proposed as an extension to Kings Hill northwards as far as Pikey Lane. The Parish Council supported the principle of such an extension and employed a planner in support of an extension. However, that point in the examination of the plan was never reached and the draft plan was subsequently withdrawn.

\* Accordingly, the Parish Council renews its support for an extension of the Green Belt eastwards from the West Malling By Pass and refers to the evidence previously submitted. It would protect the countryside between the three communities including the network of quiet Lanes and rural public paths, the conservation areas within it, and continue to provide a "green" area appreciated by the residents of the adjoining built up areas.

\* It is noted the questions refer to an Anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy which is perhaps seen as an alternative way to keep the West Malling, East Malling and the growing community of Kings Hill sperate. However, we feel that such a policy lacks the permanence of a Green Belt extension. And we are unsure if such policies can be adopted given that the strategic Gap policy that did exist in previous separating Medway Gap and Maidstone was said to be no longer a policy government supported which has resulted in the developments along Hermitage lane,

43463745 5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

1.2.40 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- (a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development;
- (b) case law
- (c) Housing Market Areas
- (d) housing affordability
- (e) policy and environmental constraints
- (f) assessed development needs
- (g) housing supply The
- (h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.2.41 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. However, the most obvious omission is delivery.

1.2.42 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

1.2.43 Our client's land is available now and the site can be brought forward early within the plan period.

1.2.44 It is also important to concentrate new employment provision in areas of established commercial activity and with the best links to the strategic road network. In this regard, our client's land is very well served.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

5.11.1 -

43485985 25240577 5.11.8

1.2.61 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- (a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development;
- (b) case law
- (c) Housing Market Areas
- (d) housing affordability
- (e) policy and environmental constraints
- (f) assessed development needs
- (g) housing supply The
- (h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.2.62 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. However, the most obvious omission is delivery.

1.2.63 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

5.11.1 -

43487649 25240577 5.11.8

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs? Yes/No Please explain  
Yes. It is already well documented that the only way that the Council can deliver the assessed development needs of the borough requires a detailed review of and the release of land from the Green Belt.

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.  
Yes. We would also add that the need to locate development in sustainable locations on the edges of main settlements should be a key factor that is considered now; and it is in the interests of proper town planning. It is fundamentally wrong to seek to avoid Green Belt release as a first priority.

43548193 38432225 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

2 TMBC REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION Background TMBC is an authority heavily constrained by Green Belt. The Council will need to consider how to balance the urgent need for market and affordable housing alongside the limitations of the Green Belt. In this regard, this representation focuses solely on this issue. Green Belt

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

Q40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

Q40. Do you agree that the set of factors listed should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Gladman agree that there are exceptional circumstances at the strategic level for altering Green Belt boundaries to help address assessed development needs. The borough is highly constrained by Green Belt (approximately 70%). The Green Belt Review prepared as part of the plan making process, published July 2022, correctly concludes that based upon the available evidence, TMBC does have a good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs. Gladman agree that the set of factors listed are suitable for justifying alterations to the Green Belt boundaries. It is important the Local Plan plans positively for the borough's future needs in a sustainable way and the spatial strategy contained in the emerging Local Plan will need to be based upon a comprehensive, up-to-date and robust evidence base. The strategic level exceptional circumstances case will need to be linked to this wider evidence base including the proposed spatial strategy, the approach to meeting housing and employment needs within the borough, the reasonable alternatives for delivering growth (as assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal) as well as the conclusions drawn from the Green Belt Review and site assessments. The Council will also need to consider the site-specific circumstances that make a site suitable for release from the Green Belt and set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land. It is encouraging to note that TMBC recognise housing affordability is already bad and worsening which is a clear indicator that supply is not keeping up with demand. The negative consequences of constraining supply for affordability, and what this means for households trying to access, as well as move up, the property ladder.

43629217 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

1.2.39 Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The council will be producing further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.

However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, employment land losses have continued with demand remaining strong, resulting in a significant requirement for new employment land (as well as increased housing targets).

1.2.40 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

1.2.41 Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

5.11.1 -  
43676929 43676897 5.11.8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

1.2.43 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- (a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development);
- (b) case law
- (c) Housing Market Areas
- (d) housing affordability
- (e) policy and environmental constraints
- (f) assessed development needs
- (g) housing supply
- (h) The potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.2.44 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release in the context of meeting housing needs, however it fails to acknowledge the potential for employment needs to also give rise to exceptional circumstances for Green Belt releases. It is therefore imperative that the Plan explicitly acknowledges this and considers the case for Green Belt releases to meet employment needs, not only housing needs.

1.2.45 Additional to the omission of employment considerations is the omission of delivery. In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites (housing and employment). Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan-led intervention (and as highlighted by the Urban Capacity Study, most likely be restricted to housing). Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

5.11.1 -

43676929 43676897 5.11.8

Question 40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent'.

Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sqm (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period. Furthermore,

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43745089 25240577 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

1.3.80 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be considered when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development)
- b) case law
- c) Housing Market Areas
- d) housing affordability
- e) policy and environmental constraints
- f) assessed development needs
- g) housing supply
- h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.3.81 Fundamentally we agree that all these matters should be considered when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. However, site specific characteristics are a key factor. Our client's site has an extremely limited role in fulfilling Green Belt objectives and represents the type of housing that will have the least impact on the strategic objectives of the Green Belt.

1.3.82 The other obvious omission is delivery. In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options and that Green Belt release is plan led rather than delivered by piecemeal appeal planning.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43781249 43781441 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs? Yes/No Please explain  
In consideration of the decision of the Council to withdraw the last Local Plan, the fact that the neighbouring authorities are facing similar challenges to addressing their assessed needs (Green Belt etc) and the conclusions of ARUP in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review, it appears there are exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundaries. This cannot be ignored.

TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL – LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18) CONSULTATION (NOVEMBER 2022)  
– LAND AT

BASTED LANE, CROUCH Page 11 of 11

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

Yes.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

42832833 42826433 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

43873729 0 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

[ X ] I support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces (Option 1).

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

|          |                      |   |   |
|----------|----------------------|---|---|
| 25296065 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>5.11 Green Belt</p> <p>We are in full agreement with the NPPF that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. There is thus a vital importance in working with neighbouring authorities to seek assistance in meeting the housing requirement imposed on TMBC by the government.</p>   | <p>Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>       |
| 42439841 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>The Green Belt:</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to any residential development in the Green Belt, particularly on prime agricultural land which is adjacent to Offham and West Malling. Once agricultural land is gone, it's gone and we must ensure the future of our country by growing more food/cereals and not being reliant on imports (the current situation in Ukraine has highlighted this problem due to shortages of grain etc.).</p> <p>I would also like to see the Green Belt extended further East from A228 to protect the separation of East and West Malling.</p>   | <p>Comments noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents, and other consultation responses.</p> |
| 42439841 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8 | <p>Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB):</p> <p>The Green Belt has to be maintained at all costs, its purpose is to provide an open space and to maintain the green wedges between parishes. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are protected, TMBC must ensure that development in these areas are restricted to maintain the views of the North Downs.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to any residential development in the Green Belt, particularly on prime agricultural land throughout Kent. Once agricultural land is gone, it's gone and we must ensure the future of our country by growing more food/cereals and not being reliant on imports (the current situation in Ukraine has highlighted this problem due to shortages of grain etc.).</p> <p>General Points:</p> <p>If we lose our Green Belt and open spaces, it will be lost forever!</p> | <p>Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>       |



Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options, including making as much use as possible of suitable greenfield sites outside of the Green Belt, suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

'Planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and

44200193 44200161 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

5.11.3 Comment

Comment noted.

42684641 0 5.11.8

The loss of greenbelt is the start of a very slippery slope.

Yes there are exceptional circumstances at the strategic level for altering Green Belt boundaries to help address the assessed development needs of the Borough. As set out in our response to question 12, it is clear from the SA and the Urban Capacity Study that there are insufficient sites within the built up areas to accommodate the Borough's housing requirement, such that greenfield sites are required to address the housing needs of the Borough. In addition it is clear that a spatial strategy that relies on greenfield sites outside the GB and AONB will not meet the housing requirement, or address the needs of the HMA's. It's also clear from the Green Belt Assessment that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of land from the Green Belt. Said exceptional circumstances include the scale of the housing need, the fact that the housing needs within the western part of the Borough, within the West Kent HMA, are located within an area wholly covered by the Green Belt; the affordability issues that impact on the Borough, as set out above; the history of under supply, as also mentioned above, and the availability of unconstrained land<sup>21</sup>. To this end we also note that the Green Belt Assessment highlights the way in which the Green Belt boundaries are tightly drawn around the main urban areas and with the exception of the eastern part of West Malling, the Rural Service Centres; and the resultant fact that any urban extensions will require an alteration to the Green Belt boundaries. Furthermore we note that the Green Belt Assessment also comments upon the Council's ability to export their housing requirements to adjacent authorities, which as the Green Belt Assessment acknowledges could push development towards Maidstone as it is less constrained than the authorities to the west, but in doing so would not address the housing needs of the West Kent HMA/ could lead to an unsustainable pattern of growth; the lack of sites within the built up area to meet the housing requirements, as evidenced by the Urban Capacity Study; and the adverse consequences for sustainable development of not allocating sufficient land.

The conclusions of the Green Belt Assessment are clear:

'The evidence currently available indicates that the Borough:

- Has a high housing demand and acute affordability challenges;
- Has an undersupply of housing which appears to be worsening;
- Is heavily constrained by policy and environmental constraints;

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The council will be producing further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.

44275681 44277153 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Yes we agree with the factors listed in para 5.11.7 should be taken into account when considering if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt (GB) boundaries in any specific area. In the context of the above we would highlight the fact that in terms of National Policy and the purposes prescribed in para.138 of the NPPF, we believe, for the reasons set out below that none of the five purposes the GB serves would be prejudiced by allocating the land at Manor Farm.

a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

The site forms part of a large area of open Green Belt land which lies adjacent to the settlement of Tonbridge. It is bound by existing highways which form defensible boundaries to the wider landscape beyond. This includes the A21 to the south which physically divides the town from the surrounding natural landscape. To the north is the Haysden Country Park.

The position of the site is considered such that it plays no direct part in preventing the sprawl of Tonbridge into the wider Green Belt and landscape setting, particularly to the south and west. Rather it is the physical features in the area such as roads, and the landscape context which prevent sprawl. For example, the land to the north and north west of the site falls within flood zones 2 and 3. This significantly limits development opportunity, and thus prevents sprawl from the town. Equally, the Country Park with its associated landscape designations and protections forms an important designation that is unlikely to alter, and therefore, contains the town in a north and west direction. The site has a direct relationship to Tonbridge, with residential development located immediately opposite the site's frontage onto Upper Haysden Lane, and estate roads accessed off this highway. The site is not required to prevent sprawl and plays a limited role, if at all, in achieving this purpose.

b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

The site falls between Tonbridge and Lower Haysden. Lower Haysden is not a small town or settlement, but rather a small hamlet of dwellings and farm complex (Manor Farm). The site forms part of a group of fields which create an extensive green gap between the two areas. Not all of these fields form part of the development site, and therefore any risk of merging is reduced.

The wider openness of the area and general spread of the Green Belt beyond the site would be maintained, ensuring both physically and visually that there is minimal, if any, risk of Tonbridge

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

44275681 44277153 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Yes. We agree that there are exceptional circumstances ('EC's') at strategic level to alter the Green Belt boundaries and consider this is essential as part of the new Local Plan to ensure housing and employment needs can be met in full.

3.134 Para. 140 and 141 of the NPPF states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where

exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans.

3.135 In accordance with the NPPF, the Council set out their strategic level EC's in the EC's Topic Paper (2022). We support this evidence base document and the conclusions which states that there are limited alternative options to

accommodate housing, therefore Green Belt release is required in the Borough as part of the new Local Plan.

3.136 We recommend the conclusions of the Topic Paper are carried forward to the Regulation 19 Local Plan which we

recommend releases Green Belt from appropriate locations.

3.137 The strategic level EC's which are set out in the Topic Paper are fully evidenced and therefore we recommend the

next steps as the Council progress their Local Plan is to consider the site specific EC's for releasing sites from the Green Belt.

Site Level Exceptional Circumstances

3.138 In addition to the strategic level EC's noted above which we support, we also recommend the Council should ensure site specific EC's are now considered as part of the new Local Plan.

3.139 When considering site level EC's, Court Lane Nurseries, Hadlow, meets the "good practice" for site level exceptional circumstances that are identified within the EC's Topic Paper (Para 2.3) and this assessment, balanced with the strategic level EC's also identified above, supports the site for release from the Green Belt as part of the new Local Plan.

3.140 A full assessment against the "best practice" site level EC's is provided at Section 4 of these representations, with

a summary provided below.

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs? and Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries?

Given the level of housing need in the Borough it would appear that the Council will need to amend Green Belt boundaries in order to meet needs. Therefore, in line with paragraph 140 and 141 of the NPPF, the Council has considered whether there are exceptional circumstances supporting Green Belt boundary amendments in Tonbridge and Malling. The Council's conclusion is that there is a strategic case for green belt boundary amendments on the basis of high demand, acute affordability issues, under supply of housing exacerbated by existing constraints and a limited opportunity to meet needs in built up areas. The HBF would agree with the Council's assessment.

As to where Green Belt boundary amendments should be made the HBF would agree that the Council needs to take into account the issues raised in paragraph 5.11.7 of the consultation document. However, whilst these issues are important the overarching drive of the Council should be to ensure that housing needs are met.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council will be producing further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.

44336545 42807969 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council will be producing further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.

25378817 0 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Question 41

Factors to Determine Exception Circumstances to Alter Green Belt Boundary

Mr and Mrs Howard support the inclusion of information from active and prospective planning applications in the factors used to determine exception circumstances e.g. from the Berkeley Homes application for Broadwater Farm TM/21/02719/OEAE.

Comment noted.

43485857 43485921 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

|          |                             |  |   |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| 38330529 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8        | <p>Councillors are strongly opposed to any residential development in the Green Belt, particularly on the prime agricultural land which is adjacent to Offham and West Malling.</p> <p>21.0 QUESTION 40: DO YOU AGREE THAT THERE ARE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES, AT THE STRATEGIC LEVEL, FOR ALTERING GREEN BELT BOUNDARIES (IN PRINCIPLE) TO HELP ADDRESS ASSESSED DEVELOPMENT NEEDS?</p> <p>21.1 In short, yes.</p> <p>21.2 The Borough is constrained by Green Belt, AONB and other sensitive designations. Berkeley's view is that there are opportunities for growth in sustainable locations, through limited Green Belt release in order to meet local housing need. A reasonable balance can be struck.</p> <p>22.0 QUESTION 41: DO YOU AGREE THAT THE SET OF FACTORS LISTED IN PARA. 5.11.7 SHOULD BE USED TO DETERMINE IF EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST TO JUSTIFY ALTERATIONS TO GREEN BELT BOUNDARIES?</p> <p>22.1 Yes, Berkeley agrees that the following matters should inform the exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green Belt boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development)</li> <li>• case law</li> <li>• Housing Market Areas</li> <li>• housing affordability</li> <li>• policy and environmental constraints</li> <li>• assessed development needs</li> <li>• housing supply</li> <li>• potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).</li> </ul> <p>22.2 However, as is set out in the Framework at paragraph 141, it should be noted that before consideration is made of exceptional circumstances, and whether Green Belt boundaries are potentially amended, proposed strategies will need to demonstrate that: as much brownfield land as possible is being utilised; development densities on sites have been optimised; and, the approach has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities (and the capacity to help accommodate identified needs).</p> | <p>Comment Noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p> <p>Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council will be producing further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.</p> |
| 44463361 | 5.11.1 -<br>25366913 5.11.8 |  |   |

[Also see Questionnaire Q.41] \*image\*. Text as follows:

JAA Table 6: Contribution of the land east of Carpenters Lane/ north of The Paddock, Hadlow to the Purposes of the Green Belt.

1. GB purpose: *Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas* . The Site is contained by existing residential properties to the south, the village hall and playing field to the east, and roads to the west and north, and enclosed by structural vegetation to the west and north. Development of the Site would not extend built form any further north or west than the current established limits of Hadlow and would be contained by existing well defined boundaries. Limited contribution to GB purposes.

2. GB purpose: *Prevent neighbouring towns from merging* . Other settlements are some distance away and therefore the development of the Site would not result in the perception of a reduction in distance between settlements or the merging of settlements. GB contribution: None.

3. GB purpose: *Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment* . Land use surrounding the Site is mixed, typical of its settlement edge location. The built up area of Hadlow adjoins the southern edge of the Site, including properties within The Paddock residential estate. Other land uses comprise agricultural land and clusters of residential properties including those to the north of the Site, washed over by the Green Belt. The Site is technically open due to its land use, akin to any site without built form. However, the perception of this openness is limited due to the visual enclosure of the Site by existing built form and vegetation. The Site's proximity to existing residential land uses and its equine land use also exerts a settlement fringe character on the Site, reducing the perception of a 'rural' landscape. GB contribution: Some.

4. GB purposes: *Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns* . The Site is not part of a Conservation Area, nor does it have a visual or physical relationship with either of the Conservation Areas within Hadlow. GB Contribution: None.

5. GB purpose: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The Site is not within an urban area. GB Contribution: N/a

Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration with the site analysis and site selection process. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

5.11.1 -

44417409 25392865 5.11.8

[41.1 - 41.6 are included in the Questionnaire response]

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

41.7 In terms of case law and having regard to the case of Calverton Parish Council v Greater Nottingham Councils [2015] EWHC 10784 which indicated that a Council should, at the very least, identify and consider the following matters when looking release land from the Green Belt:

- i. the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- ii. the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- iii. (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- iv. the nature and extent of harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and,
- v. the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonable practicable extent

41.8 We would submit that:

- i. It is acknowledged within the Reg 18 Plan and the supporting documents that there is an acute housing need in the Borough. This is in our opinion unequivocally, as evidenced by our comments in response to questions 5 and 12, and we do not repeat them again here.
- ii. It is acknowledged that the supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development that falls outside the Green Belt, in Tonbridge and Malling is severely limited. 71% of the Borough falls within the Green Belt, including the totality of the West Kent HMA which is the area experiencing the worst affordability issues. The Urban Capacity Study and Green Belt Assessment both acknowledge that there is not sufficient land within the built up area to meet all the Borough's housing needs, indeed the Urban Capacity Study suggests at para 60 that there is only capacity for some 1,946 dwellings within the urban areas which is only about a fifth of the residual need identified in table 2 of the Reg 18 Plan, taking at face value the scale of development to be delivered from extant permissions and windfall development. Furthermore the SA, Green Belt Assessment, and Reg 18 Plan itself all acknowledge the fact that directing growth to the least constrained parts of the Borough would lead to

However, Hildenborough Parish Council have a number of points it wishes to emphasize:

- \* Hildenborough Parish Council is concerned that Hildenborough remains a self-contained village and that a green belt is left surrounding it, ensuring it does not become engulfed in Tonbridge urbanized areas. Currently this is the case with the River Bourne bounding Tonbridge Farm sports area, Tonbridge School playing fields as well as the Medway flood plain
- \* They appreciated that some Metropolitan Green Belt must inevitably be sacrificed but would like to see all available brownfield sites developed as a priority.
- \* Where Metropolitan Green Belt boundaries are adjusted the Council is most concerned that housing etc is built adjacent to current housing – they are most concerned that isolated development within the Metropolitan Green Belt is not accepted.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

44417409 25392865 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

38330977 0 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Site specific factors

Site specific characteristics are a key factor. It is of vital importance that the Green Belt study being prepared by Arup is:

- undertaken robustly,
- examines the performance of sites:
  - o against the Green Belt purposes as set out at paragraph 138 of the NPPF;
  - o against the requirements of paragraph 142 of the NPPF, including channelling development towards urban, towns and villages inside the Green Belt boundary (such as Tonbridge, Hildenborough and Hadlow), and is well served by public transport (such as buses and trains at Hildenborough station);
  - o against the requirements of paragraph 143 f) of the NPPF as to whether sites have definable, readily recognisable and permanent physical boundaries;
- looks at sites which are both immediately adjacent to settlements, but also those which are next to sites which are immediately adjacent: i.e. to consider how that site would perform if the site immediately adjacent were to also be allocated.

Fernham Homes consider that Land at Maidstone Road, Hadlow will demonstrate that the site performs relatively poorly in Green Belt terms.

Site [59692] – immediately adjacent to Goldings Yard, Stocks Green Road – was proposed to be allocated in the January 2019 LP under Policy LP25 X: Housing Allocations Land at Stocks Green Road, Hildenborough for 105 dwellings. In the TMBC Green Belt Exceptional Circumstances Topic Paper16 it was set out that release of this land “could result in only limited harm to the Green Belt and its openness at this location” and that one of the reasons that this harm will be reduced is it is bounded by Stocks Green Road to the north and the railway line to the south.

These conclusions apply equally to Goldings Yard, Stocks Green Road, and it is accordingly of vital importance that the study considers the potential of this site in that context.

Deliverability

In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that TMBC must assess potential for development in the built-up areas – and is

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of East Malling, West Malling and Kings Hill.

This would protect the open rural landscape and the merging of distinct local communities.

It would safeguard the precious Conservation areas including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street.

The current boundary is inappropriate.

We need to protect our wildlife, excellent farm land, beautiful countryside, and ancient historic settlements. We also need to protect the area from pollution.

We need to protect our quiet lanes and the area for walkers, horse riders and people’s general wellbeing.

There is a real danger that we will end up with a sprawling conurbation of development with no green spaces for local communities in this end of the borough.

Comment noted. This matter will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

44459553

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that TMBC must assess potential for development in the built-up areas – and is I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of East Malling, West Malling and Kings Hill. This would protect the open rural landscape and the merging of distinct local communities. It would safeguard the precious Conservation areas including New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street. The current boundary is inappropriate. We need to protect our wildlife, excellent farm land, beautiful countryside, and ancient historic settlements. We also need to protect the area from pollution. We need to protect our quiet lanes and the area for walkers, horse riders and people’s general wellbeing. There is a real danger that we will end up with a sprawling conurbation of development with no green spaces for local communities in this end of the borough.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

44629217

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

I am very much against building on the green belt; we need our arable fields, our open spaces, wildlife and nature and this should be protected for our children and grandchildren at all costs. We have some beautiful local areas of outstanding natural beauty which everyone in the Borough is able to enjoy and we cannot allow building to destroy these.

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated practice guidance.

45175233

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8



Green Belt

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs? Yes/No Please explain

3.68 A Stage 2 Green Belt assessment has been prepared to establish whether there are exceptional circumstances in TMBC to justify potential alterations to the Green Belt boundaries through the plan making process.

3.69 There is no formal definition or criteria on what constitutes exceptional circumstances however there are a number of legal judgements which assist in determining what may constitute exceptional circumstance and establishing a precedent for exceptional circumstances. The most established case being Gallagher Homes Limited v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council which set out the following:

- Planning guidance is a material consideration for plan-making and decision taking. However, it does not have statutory force: the only statutory obligation is to have regard to relevant policies.
- It is not arguable that the mere process of preparing a new local plan could itself be regarded as an exceptional circumstance justifying an alteration to a Green Belt boundary. National guidance has always dealt with revisions of the Green Belt in the context of reviews of local plans [...] and has always required exceptional circumstances to do this.
- Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision to a Green Belt boundary, whether it is considering the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt.
- Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law.' This means that it is not enough for a local authority or inspector to assert that exceptional circumstances exist; it is not possible to convert unexceptional circumstances into exceptional circumstances simply by labelling them as such.

3.70 In addition, the Gallagher Homes Limited case established that when considering whether to alter the boundary of the Green Belt, the starting point for every local authority is that this decision should only arise after all reasonable and acceptable efforts have been taken to maximise the amount of development within the urban

[Comment entered under any other comment]

I object strongly to the plans to use green belt land for further development. Green belt land was designed to help protect urban sprawl from development not to become easy pickings for developers to build on.

[[Comment entered under infrastructure section]

[Comment entered under any other comment]

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated practice guidance.

42819617

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

45292513

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

Green Belt

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs? Yes/No Please explain

3.77 A Stage 2 Green Belt assessment has been prepared and sets out whether there are exceptional circumstances in TMBC to justify potential alterations to the Green Belt boundaries through the plan making process.

3.78 There is no formal definition or criteria on what constitutes exceptional circumstances however there are a number of legal judgements which assist in determining what may constitute an exceptional circumstance and establishing a precedent for exceptional circumstances. The most established case being Gallagher Homes Limited v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council which set out the following:

- Planning guidance is a material consideration for plan-making and decision taking. However, it does not have statutory force: the only statutory obligation is to have regard to relevant policies.
- It is not arguable that the mere process of preparing a new Local Plan could itself be regarded as an exceptional circumstance justifying an alteration to a Green Belt boundary. National guidance has always dealt with revisions of the Green Belt in the context of reviews of local plans [...] and has always required exceptional circumstances to do this.
- Exceptional circumstances are required for any revision to a Green Belt boundary, whether it is considering the proposal is to extend or diminish the Green Belt.
- Whilst each case is fact-sensitive and the question of whether circumstances are exceptional for these purposes requires an exercise of planning judgment, what is capable of amounting to exceptional circumstances is a matter of law.' This means that it is not enough for a local authority or inspector to assert that exceptional circumstances exist; it is not possible to convert unexceptional circumstances into exceptional circumstances simply by labelling them as such.

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

42819617

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road , East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling , East Malling and Kings Hill.  
This would prevent the merging of local villages and Kings Hill.  
Protect the open rural landscape.  
Safeguard the setting of the historic towns of East and West Malling and their Conservation Areas, including New Barns , Broadwater Farm and Well Street Conservation Area.

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

I agree with the exceptional circumstances for the extension of the Green Belt.  
The current boundary is inappropriate.  
This will check the unrestricted sprawl of Kings Hill.  
Preserve the integrity and identity of the existing settlements.  
Preserve the countryside from encroachment.  
Safeguard the “ best and most versatile agricultural land “on Broadwater Farm and protect its viability.  
We need to reduce food miles travelled and to grow more produce sustainably in the garden of England. If this land is built on it will be gone forever.  
The Green Belt extension will protect wild life, flora, fauna and air quality.  
This extension would protect the area from light, noise and air pollution.  
It would preserve the green lung between the existing settlements enabling residents to continue to enjoy walking, safe cycling, horse riding, running and safe rural family experiences in the countryside.  
The Green Belt extension would protect and respect the legally protected QUIET LANES designation. Water Lane , Lavenders Road, Pikey Lane ,Stickens Lane, Well Street , The Heath and part of Broadwater Road were designated Quiet Lanes under Section 268 of The Transport Act 2000.  
This would secure the open rural views from Kings Hill , a high point in the landscape , across the Medway Gap to the North Downs for future generations.  
It would promote a green corridor for wild life from Manor Park in West Malling across to Wateringbury Road and Barming Woods.

I sincerely hope you take these important points into consideration and agree to extend this Green Belt Boundary

42720481

5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

Where should development be located in the borough (4.3) The Metropolitan Green Belt

The most significant environmental constraint for the main part of the borough is the metropolitan green belt. The word 'metropolitan' needs strong emphasis here, as the green belt that covers a large part of the borough exists to protect urban sprawl of London and its environs as defined by its green belt.

The green belt that encircles Tonbridge is not the green belt of Tonbridge and nor is it the green belt of any other particular town or settlement in this or other affected boroughs and districts; it is the metropolitan green belt that exists to protect – through openness – the countryside within its extent, from development around London.

Importantly, the green belt does not exist to protect against the expansion or connection of outlying settlements; indeed, the imperative of green belt protection may well necessitate the growth and even coalescence of settlements outside the green belt boundaries, so that development can be accommodated locally that does not impact on the openness of the green belt.

In this respect, the Council should be mindful of acting in accordance with National Planning Policy and not putting the wishes of current residents of one or more part of the borough over and above national policy protections.

This is about planning and not politics.

National Planning Policy on the green belt is very clear:

\* The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

\* Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified

\* Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Comments Noted. The Council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

42766209 5.11.1 -  
0 5.11.8

5. Green Belt

5.1 It has been understood for sometime that exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary in the Borough in order to meet present day and future development needs. The now withdrawn Local Plan proposed a number of allocations within the Green Belt in this premise.

5.2 It is instructive that the Arup Green Belt Assessment commissioned by the Borough Council and published in July 2022 concludes that the evidence currently available indicates that the Borough:

- a. Has a high housing demand and acute affordability challenges;
- b. Has an undersupply of housing which appears to be worsening;
- c. Is heavily constrained by policy and environmental constraints;
- d. Has limited opportunity to accommodate its needs within existing built-up areas; and
- e. Is likely to have limited ability to export its housing need to neighbouring authorities.

5.3 Based upon the available evidence, the Borough Council's consultants consider that there is a "good strategic exceptional circumstances case for altering the Green Belt boundaries to help meet the assessed development needs". That is in no way surprising.

5.4 The 2007 Core Strategy – now 15 years old - acknowledged that with the Metropolitan Green Belt the expansion of existing settlements is tightly restricted. Other than for in the northeast of the Borough, the Green Belt continues to restrict the extent to which those settlements can grow. This is plainly not a sustainable proposition.

5.5 The Green Belt at East Peckham has not been altered for a great many years and successive Local Plans have retained the Green Belt boundary at East Peckham contiguous with its built-up area.

5.6 Therefore, for East Peckham to contribute new development land as part of any version of the spatial strategy, the boundary of the Green Belt as presently drawn will need to be amended. This is evident from the fact the withdrawn Local Plan proposed housing allocations at East Peckham that were within the Green Belt (allocations T and V for a combined 58 dwellings). This principle endures to the present day and the need for this is heightened because of the greater scale of new housing that must be accommodated.

5.7 Consequently, new housing has been restricted to small scale infill opportunities which are to all intents and purposes now exhausted. Whilst the Urban Capacity Study (July 2022) found only one previously developed site

6.6 Green Belt: It is plainly the case that there exist exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary in the Borough generally and at East Peckham specifically. Such an amendment should be of a sufficient extent to allow development needs to be met over longer term (i.e., beyond the plan period proposed) so that the new Green Belt boundary can endure.

6.7 At East Peckham, the Green Belt function relates to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Whilst this is an important function in overall terms, as part of plan-led strategy to meet prevalent development needs that is not an overriding characteristic, in comparison with, say preventing towns from merging, or preserving the setting of a historic town.

6.8 In this context, the harm to the Green Belt designation and the totality of its purposes would be limited. New development could be sited to the north of Church Lane without any discernible effect on the Green Belt achieving its purposes more generally.

6.9 The sustainable location of the land to the north of Church Lane, East Peckham offers the opportunity to create a 'Landscape-led' residential development, capable of delivery 220 – 250 new homes and community facilities alongside generous green infrastructure that sensitively integrates the development into the landscape. The Site affords the opportunity to delivery at least 10% biodiversity net gain, new parkland, extended recreational opportunities as well as delivering much needed new homes (market housing, affordable housing, first homes) for the existing and future community.

Comments noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council will be producing further evidence in relation to the Green Belt.

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

5.11.1 -

45440929 45440705 5.11.8

5.11.1 -

45440929 45440705 5.11.8

|          |                             |   |   |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| 42762497 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8        | <p>The Green Belt:<br/>I am strongly opposed to any residential development in the Green Belt, particularly on prime agricultural land which is adjacent to Offham and West Malling. Once agricultural land is gone, it's gone and we must ensure the future of our country by growing more food/cereals and not being reliant on imports (the current situation in Ukraine has highlighted this problem due to shortages of grain etc.).<br/>I would also like to see the Green Belt extended further East from A228 to protect the separation of East and West Malling.</p>   | Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.   |
| 42762497 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8        | <p>Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB):<br/>The Green Belt has to be maintained at all costs, its purpose is to provide an open space and to maintain the green wedges between parishes. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are protected, TMBC must ensure that development in these areas are restricted to maintain the views of the North Downs.<br/>I am strongly opposed to any residential development in the Green Belt, particularly on prime agricultural land throughout Kent. Once agricultural land is gone, it's gone and we must ensure the future of our country by growing more food/cereals and not being reliant on imports (the current situation in Ukraine has highlighted this problem due to shortages of grain etc.).<br/>General Points:<br/>If we lose our Green Belt and open spaces, it will be lost forever!<br/>Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council must ensure that Brownfield sites are built on first and any abandoned/derelict housing within the borough should be brought back into active housing stock.<br/>Some of the sites that have been allocated for development throughout Kent are currently car parks. Building on these sites would seriously impact local shopping areas and the businesses that rely on the footfall.</p>  | Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation. |
| 25240641 | 25240577 5.11.1 -<br>5.11.8 | <p>Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.<br/>1.2.42 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:<br/>(a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development;<br/>(b) case law<br/>(c) Housing Market Areas<br/>(d) housing affordability<br/>(e) policy and environmental constraints<br/>(f) assessed development needs<br/>(g) housing supply<br/>(h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).<br/>1.2.43 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. However, the most obvious omission is delivery.<br/>1.2.44 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.</p> | Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.   |

Q.40. Do you agree that there are exceptional circumstances, at the strategic level, for altering Green Belt boundaries (in principle) to help address assessed development needs?

4.1.63 Yes. We acknowledge that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the Council must demonstrate that it has examined all other reasonable options making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; optimising the density of development and informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities. However, these exercises were carried out in detail as part of the previous Local Plan work and evidence established that Green Belt release is needed. Since this time, annual housing requirements have increased significantly.

4.1.64 Notwithstanding the earlier decisions and evidence, housing and employment needs remain a core part of why exceptional circumstance exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries.

4.1.65 Case law, (Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council, Broxtowe Borough Council and Gedling Borough Council [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) also provide guidelines for determining whether exceptional circumstances exist. The above judgement states:

‘planning judgments involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances in the context of both national policy and the positive obligation located in section 39(2) should, at least ideally, identify and then grapple with the following matters:

- (i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important);
- (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;
- (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;
- (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and
- (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent’.

4.1.66 Considering these parameters in turn, the acuteness of the local and economic housing need is clear in the need to deliver 15,941 new homes and 296,260 sq.m (69.8ha) of employment provision in the plan period.

Furthermore, the Council’s Green Belt Assessment prepared by Arup also confirms that TMBC does have a good

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

5.11.1 -

45864993 25240577 5.11.8

Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

4.1.67 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- (a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development;
- (b) case law
- (c) Housing Market Areas
- (d) housing affordability
- (e) policy and environmental constraints
- (f) assessed development needs
- (g) housing supply The
- (h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

4.1.68 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. The most obvious omission is delivery.

4.1.69 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

5.11.1 -

45864993 25240577 5.11.8



Q.41. Do you agree with that the set of factors listed in para. 5.11.7 should be used to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries? Yes/No. If no, please explain, highlighting additional/alternative factors that you consider need to be included in the review process.

1.2.41 The plan highlights a set of factors that need to be taken into account when reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries to determine if exceptional circumstances exist to justify local alterations. These are:

- (a) National policy (purposes of the designation and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development;
- (b) case law
- (c) Housing Market Areas
- (d) housing affordability
- (e) policy and environmental constraints
- (f) assessed development needs
- (g) housing supply
- (h) potential for development in the built-up areas (Urban Capacity Study).

1.2.42 Fundamentally we agree that all of these matters should be taken into account when making a judgement about the locations for Green Belt release. However, the most obvious omission is delivery.

1.2.43 In respect of making a judgement on site allocations, it is imperative that the plan includes a range of deliverable sites. Whilst it is recognised that the Council must assess potential for development in the built-up areas, the reality is that many of these will come forward for development without plan led intervention. Those that have consistently delayed are often not forthcoming because of viability or wider ownership constraints. It is therefore essential that deliverability is a core component when considering options.

1.2.44 Our client's land is available now and can be brought forward early within the plan period.

1.2.45 It is also important to concentrate new employment provision in areas of established commercial activity and with the best links to the strategic road network. In this regard, our client's land is very well served.

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

45875041 25240577 5.11.1 - 5.11.8

Your new Local Plan will shape our communities until 2040 when I shall probably no longer be here but I must send you my thoughts to save our villages and the lanes.

Through your Local Plan consultation, you are asking for my thoughts on the principles that should determine where 15,941 new homes are to be built within the boundaries of Tonbridge and Malling.

I am emailing because your consultation questionnaire is very long and too specific and proposed developments in the villages of Ightham and Ivy Hatch are disturbing.

I believe the Green Belt should be protected.

I believe the individual identify of our villages should be protected.

Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) - the villages of Ightham and Ivy Hatch sit within the MGB.

Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) - the villages of Ightham and Ivy Hatch with within the AONB.

Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

42468289 5.11.1 - 0 5.11.8

The purpose of the MGB is to protect the countryside.

The purpose of the MGB is to prevent urban sprawl.

|          |                                      |   |   |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
|          |                                      | Q40, Q41 and Q42 on TMBC Questionnaire and comments on local plan.<br>This is to confirm that I would like to see the green belt extended.<br>I support the extension of the green belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up area of West Malling and East Malling.<br>This would incorporate a beautiful area of Kent countryside which is currently used for recreational purposes by local residents and is home to many species of birds.<br>It would protect the open rural landscape, prevent the merging of local villages and Kings Hill, and safeguard the setting of the historic town of West Malling and village of East Malling, together with their conservation areas and those of New Barns, Broadwater Farm and Well Street. | Comments Noted. These matters will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation. |
| 45932865 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8                 | Regarding the local plan, this email is to state I totally object to any building on the green belt in Tonbridge and Malling. The area has already become awfully suburbanised by the development which has been allowed. The "Lancaster Park" development on King hill being an awful example of a country lane becoming suburbanised and spoilt. All development should be in towns where buildings of more stories should be allowed in the town centre. I would only accept any new house building in the area at all, if it is on the vacated Celcon site only after they have moved somewhere else.   | Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.                  |
| 25104193 | 5.11.1 -<br>0 5.11.8                 | Please send this email to those dealing with your consultation on your local plan.  |   |
| 42330785 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | The ancient coppice woodland at the boundary of part of Kingshill should be protected. Some is already at risk from a planning application  | Noted. However, comments on specific live planning applications are Development Management matters.   |
| 42541281 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | Focus on Tonbridge not Kings Hill for further development   | Comment noted. This matter will be reflected upon in the next Regulation 18 document.   |
|          |                                      | Expansion increases coalescence of communities in North East but could protect the golf course from development.  | Comments noted. These matters will be reflected upon in the next Regulation 18 document.  |
| 42442561 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | Further expansion of North East of borough increased coalescence of communities in an area which is already over developed.   |   |
| 42646849 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | Brownfield site development   | Comment noted. This matter will be reflected upon in the next Regulation 18 document.   |
| 42806945 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | The Green Belt could be extended with benefit to the area to be enclosed but only if the rest of the MGB is protected. In no circumstances should there be any kind of swap. That means no area of existing MGB should be removed from its protection.  | Comment noted. This matter will be reflected upon in the next Regulation 18 document.   |
|          |                                      | GREEN BELT<br>The first stage has concluded that there are exceptional circumstances at strategic level which justify the alteration of the GREEN BELT boundaries<br>THIS IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE. There can never be any circumstances which should allow housing on a GREEN BELT site.  | Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.                  |
|          |                                      | Q 41 There is ample land that is not GREEN BELT that should be built on first. Most of that is Greenfield that provides non-coalescence of settlement, and all is crucial for our food security. We end up with plenty of housing, but we all starve.   |   |
| 43412865 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | Q 42 We need to extend the outer boundary of the GREEN BELT not encroach upon it.<br>Q 43 We need to protect the greenfield sites.  |   |

|          |          |                                      |   |  |
|----------|----------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 43548193 | 38432225 | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>Figure 10   | <p>Q.42. Area beyond outer Green Belt boundary – strategic options<br/>We do not agree with any of the three options. We also find that the ‘outer green belt’ is poorly explained in the Regulation 18 Local Plan and is not shown adequately on any of the key diagrams. This question may yield poor responses.</p> <p>Q.43. What are your reasons for selecting this policy option for the area beyond the outer Green Belt boundary (outline briefly)?<br/>Not applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* I support the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the general line of Wateringbury Road, East Malling between the built up areas of West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill.</li> <li>* It would prevent the neighbouring areas of Maidstone, Kings Hill, Ditton, West Malling, Larkfield, East Malling and Leybourne, from merging into one another. The Parish Council have written to TMBC confirming that they agree that the communities need to be kept separate and not merge into one urban area</li> <li>* It would assist in safeguarding Broadwater Farm , The Heath , Manor Park , Warren woods Country Park and The Research Station together with the extensive footpaths, cycling, walking, horse riding which are enjoyed along the registered Quiet Lanes.</li> <li>* It would protect the special setting of historic West Malling, East Malling and the conservation areas including Bradbourne House, New Barns , Broadwater Farm and Well Street with their numerous Listed Buildings and registered Quiet Lanes. TMBC has a duty to preserve and enhance areas such as these and the views in and out of such areas</li> <li>* The Green Belt extension would protect wild life, flora, fauna and air quality. It would protect the area from light, noise and air pollution and would preserve the green lung between the existing settlements enabling the residents and visitors to continue to enjoy rambling, walking, cycling and horse riding. A visit on one Sunday would see all of these experiences.</li> <li>* The Green Belt extension would protect and respect the legally protected QUIET LANES designation. Water Lane, Lavenders Road, Pikey Lane, Stickens Lane, Well Street, The Heath and part of Broadwater Road were all designated Quiet Lanes under Section 268 of the Transport Act 2000.</li> </ul> | <p>Comments noted. The council will be producing further Green Belt evidence in support of Regulation 18.</p> <p>Comments noted. These matters will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p> |
| 43773921 |          | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 | <p>Green Belt Extension &amp; Heritage Asset Protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Previous Local Plan rightly off-set Broadwater Farm development of 900+ homes with Green Belt from west of West Malling town across to Wateringbury Road, East Malling.</li> <li>* This provision seems to have been completely omitted in the new plans and it appears that the whole of Broadwater Farm is being considered for development.</li> <li>* The proposed development at 40 Acres has a direct impact on the local community and infrastructure.</li> <li>* Without protection of the green space between East Malling, West Malling and Kings Hill, there could be a huge development of greater than 3300 dwellings, larger than Kings Hill.</li> <li>* This would lead to total coalescence of West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill, swallowing up the distinct historic hamlet settlements of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.</li> <li>* Should some of the planned developments go ahead we will lose access to our narrow lanes and quiet lanes which provides a network of corridors for recreational use for horse riders, walkers and cyclists. Young families and retired older people (who like to improve their health and mobility) and recreational cyclists of all ages use these lanes to avoid busy A roads and avoid cars.</li> <li>* The “Options to Prevent Merging of Settlements in the North-East of the Borough” highlights some of the further harmful effects any additional development in the area would have.</li> <li>* Communities and their boundaries should be protected by ideally by Green Belt or less ideally, other enforceable Strategic Gaps (anti coalescence) measures</li> <li>* Through communication from BAG &amp; other parties TMBC are aware of the importance of the landscape in and around East Malling, West Malling, out towards Wateringbury and as far as Wouldham.</li> </ul>  | <p>Comments noted. These matters will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p>   |
| 44236769 |          | 5.11.9 -<br>5.11.13 &<br>0 Figure 10 |   |  |

1. WMPC has argued for an extension to the Green Belt since the 1990s.
2. It is consistently well supported by our residents.
3. Following a Public Consultation meeting WMPC has received to date 102 response forms on this issue.
4. 91 supported the option of extending the Green Belt. 2 supported the anti-coalescence policy, 3 supported either extending the Green Belt and/or the anti-coalescence policy, and 6 supported no change.
5. WMPC wishes to see the boundary redrawn broadly along Wateringbury Road and Pikey Lane for the following reasons:
  - a. To retain a clear separation between East and West Malling and Kings Hill community to avoid the merging of these three communities. The green fields between them have already been lessened by permissions on King Hill of around 150 houses, and Forty Acres. The Call for Sites has generated new proposals in Stickens Lane, Clare Lane, Mill Street and Red Hill, which will erode it further if approved. The redrawing of the Green Belt is necessary and urgent.
  - b. To protect the rural setting of the historic town of West Malling. West Malling Parish straddles the current Green Belt boundary, which runs along the western edge of the built-up area. Open land to the west of the town is protected within the Green Belt, whilst land to the east of the town lies outside the Green Belt. Unfortunately, the Scheduled Ancient Monument of St Mary's Abbey lies on that vulnerable eastern flank of the town.  
The town is a very popular place to live, and this division has resulted in pressure from developers on the eastern side of the town, which has continued to the present day. We have had to fight two appeals which would have destroyed the Farm-Abbey-Town landscape in recent years. Such a boundary would protect the Conservation Areas of West Malling, St Leonards, and Broadwater and New Barns.
  - c. WMPC and EMLPC have successfully persuaded KCC to Register a Quiet Lanes

Comments noted. These matters will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.

5.11.9 -  
5.11.13 &  
0 Figure 10

38330625

The three parishes of West Malling, East Malling and Larkfield and Leybourne jointly commissioned a proof of evidence by Mr K Goodwin in support of their argument for an eastward extension of the Green Belt. Within this document Mr Goodwin lays out the results of his survey of the land north and south of the railway line broadly as far as east as Wateringbury Road and demonstrates how this area would fulfil the special circumstances required to justify such a boundary change. In Area 1 he notes that such a boundary would include the KCC Manor Park Country Park.

Comments noted. These matters will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses. The council is preparing new green belt evidence to support plan-preparation.

Evidence on the Consideration of the Extension of Green Belt in Tonbridge and Malling District Council.

1. This Tonbridge and Malling draft Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination. The new Local Plan will provide planning policies until 2031. The Regulation 18 version of the draft Local Plan proposed the extension of the Green Belt eastwards from the current boundary at West Malling.

2. The Submission version of the draft Local Plan now proposes the extension of the Green Belt boundary further east to broadly Wateringbury Road. The representations submitted seek the extension of the Green Belt further east, to Kiln Barn Road, as shown on page 49 of the Councils document - Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council Local Plan Green Belt Exceptional Circumstances Topic Paper (ED10).

3. The first hearings (Stage 1) into the local plan on a topic basis have been arranged and will hear evidence between October and November 2020. Matter 3 deals with the Metropolitan Green Belt (Policy LP 3) and evidence is scheduled to be heard on 4th and 5th November 2020.

4. I am instructed by West Malling and East Malling Parish Councils in respect of the proposals in the draft Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan for the extension of the Green Belt, generally in an eastern direction from its current boundary.

5. My evidence is set out in the following manner within this Statement:

- How the Framework approaches the designation of the Green Belt;
- How the current Green Belt came about and when;
- The context of the area that is subject to the proposed extension;
- The draft Local Plan approach to the proposed extension;
- The assessment that I have undertaken to underpin the proposed extension;
- The alternative policy approach to protect the land in the absence of a Green Belt;

38330625 5.11.9 -  
5.11.13 &  
0 Figure 10

Question 42 Green Belt Extension

Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.

43485857 43485921 5.11.9 -  
5.11.13 &  
0 Figure 10

Mr and Mrs Howard support Option 1 to extend the Green Belt to help protect the green spaces of the north east of the borough around West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill.

Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.

38330529 5.11.9 -  
5.11.13 &  
0 Figure 10

Offham Parish Council would like to see the Green Belt extended further East from A228 to protect the separation of East and West Malling.

23.0 QUESTION 42/43: PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PREFERRED STRATEGIC POLICY OPTION FOR THE AREA BEYOND THE OUTER GREEN BELT BOUNDARY

23.1 Berkeley has significant concerns about the proposed strategy presented here and seeks some urgent clarification.

23.2 The 'strategic gap' identified Figure 10 in the consultation document appears to include Broadwater Farm (site ID: 59740), which is currently being considered for housing through the application process, and which is identified indicatively as a "focus for growth" in four of the five spatial distribution options identified in section 4 of the consultation document. Whilst it is possible this is a mapping issue, there is clearly an inconsistency between those options and the allocation of Broadwater Farm which was previously supported by the Council. Berkeley objects to a gap policy being applied to the Broadwater Farm site.

23.3 Berkeley also objected to the Council's approach to proposing Green Belt extensions in this area in the previous (now withdrawn plan). It was Berkeley's opinion that the case put forward by the Council for its proposed extension to the Green Belt did not amount to exceptional circumstances; they were nothing more than an assessment of function and performance. The same arguments apply in so far as Option 1 (extend the outer boundary of the Green Belt) and Option 2 (anti-coalescence/strategic gap policy) are concerned.

23.4 Berkeley acknowledges that important areas of countryside need to be protected and that there will be locations where it is appropriate to maintain separation between settlements. There is, however, no need or justification in so far as the land north of King Hill is concerned. This area (i.e., Broadwater Farm (site ID: 59740)) is a prime and sustainable location for a strategic level of development and one where a general countryside policy and or/an appropriately worded site-specific policy can ensure that any issues around coalescence can be addressed.

23.5 Accordingly, Berkeley would urge the Council to adopt Option 3 – "no change – leave existing outer Green belt unaltered."

Comment noted. These matters will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses. The Council notes that a planning application for the development of this land (Broadwater Farm) has been received and therefore further appropriate timely assessment in terms of the legislative context and good practice needs to be given to proposals both from a forward planning and a development management perspective.

5.11.9 -  
5.11.13 &

44463361 25366913 Figure 10

\* Previous Local Plan rightly off-set Broadwater Farm development of 900+ homes with Green Belt from west of West Malling town across to Wateringbury Road, East Malling.

\* This provision seems to have been completely omitted in the new plans and it appears that the whole of Broadwater Farm is being considered for development.

\* The proposed development at 40 Acres has a direct impact on the local community and infrastructure.

\* Without protection of the green space between East Malling, West Malling and Kings Hill, there could be a huge development of greater than 3300 dwellings, larger than Kings Hill.

\* This would lead to total coalescence of West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill, swallowing up the distinct historic hamlet settlements of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.

\* Should some of the planned developments go ahead we will lose access to our narrow lanes and quiet lanes which provides a network of corridors for recreational use for horse riders, walkers and cyclists. Young families and retired older people (who like to improve their health and mobility) and recreational cyclists of all ages use these lanes to avoid busy A roads and avoid cars.

\* The "Options to Prevent Merging of Settlements in the North-East of the Borough" highlights some of the further harmful effects any additional development in the area would have.

\* Communities and their boundaries should be protected by ideally by Green Belt or less ideally, other enforceable Strategic Gaps (anti coalescence) measures

\* Through communication from BAG & other parties TMBC are aware of the importance of the landscape in and around East Malling, West Malling, out towards Wateringbury and as far as Wouldham.

Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.

5.11.9 -  
5.11.13 &

45217569 0 Figure 10

|          |                                |   |  |  |
|----------|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
|          |                                | Green Belt Extension  |  |  |
|          |                                | * Previous Local Plan rightly off-set Broadwater Farm development of 900+ homes with Green Belt from west of West Malling town across to Wateringbury Road, East Malling.   |  | Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.   |
|          |                                | * This provision seems to have been completely omitted in the new plans and it appears that the whole of Broadwater Farm is being considered for development.   |  |  |
|          |                                | * The proposed development at 40 Acres has a direct impact on the local community and infrastructure.   |  |  |
|          |                                | * Without protection of the green space between East Malling, West Malling and Kings Hill, there could be a huge development of greater than 3300 dwellings, larger than Kings Hill.  |  |  |
|          |                                | * This would lead to total coalescence of West Malling, East Malling and Kings Hill, swallowing up the distinct historic hamlet settlements of New Barns, Springetts Hill and Well Street.  |  |  |
|          |                                | * Should some of the planned developments go ahead we will lose access to our narrow lanes and quiet lanes which provides a network of corridors for recreational use for horse riders, walkers and cyclists. Young families and retired older people (who like to improve their health and mobility) and recreational cyclists of all ages use these lanes to avoid busy A roads and avoid cars.                       |  |  |
|          |                                | * The "Options to Prevent Merging of Settlements in the North-East of the Borough" highlights some of the further harmful effects any additional development in the area would have.  |  |  |
|          |                                | * Communities and their boundaries should be protected by ideally by Green Belt or less ideally, other enforceable Strategic Gaps (anti coalescence) measures   |  |  |
|          |                                | * Through communication from BAG & other parties TMBC are aware of the importance of the landscape in and around East Malling, West Malling, out towards Wateringbury and as far as Wouldham.   |  |  |
| 45509121 | 5.11.9 - 5.11.13 & 0 Figure 10 |   |  |  |
| 46121761 | 5.11.9 - 5.11.13 & 0 Figure 10 | We support the Green Belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling to protect individual character of the settlements and important green spaces.  |  | Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.   |
| 46129473 | 5.11.9 - 5.11.13 & 0 Figure 10 | I support the green belt being extended around Kings Hill, East Malling and West Malling which would then protect the individual character of the villages and therefore protect the green spaces. By protecting the green belt, it would allow for the planting of more trees.   |  | Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.   |
| 42016897 | 0 5.11.14                      | * Start with and prioritise brown field sites   |  | Comment noted  |
| 42039457 | 0 5.11.14                      | With the cost of living crises and escalating interest rates, we are heading for a housing crash with homeowners defaulting on their mortgages. Prices will then reset at lower, more affordable levels. Very careful consideration of these impacts must be kept under review for the duration of the Local Plan and continual review of the actual demand for new homes must be fed into the decision-making process. |  | Comment noted  |
| 42213665 | 0 5.11.14                      |   |  | Comment noted. The council will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the Local Plan after adoption and in accordance with Government stipulations in National Guidance and Planning good practice |
| 42646849 | 0 5.11.14                      | Again, develop brownfield not green belt and farmland. Any housing targets should reflect the extent of National designations such as AONB and Green Belt.  |  | Comment noted  |
| 25349153 | 0 5.11.14                      |   |  | Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.  |
| 42723457 | 0 5.11.14                      | I don't agree. That is based on Housing Developers' lazy thinking and reluctance to move from their standard building blueprints. TMBC have already successfully challenged the GreenBelt so the way this is all being argued is that you are going to do so again.   |  | Comment noted.   |
| 38333377 | 0 5.11.14                      |   |  | Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.  |

|          |           |  |   |
|----------|-----------|--|---|
|          |           | <p>By promoting denser housing in urban areas (saving the Green Belt) means more housing can be supplied, thus supply is not constrained &amp; supply will NOT have the effect of enabling housing affordability. Dense house development can lead to affordable housing as land costs on a finite site are spread amongst more households, making it easier for young households to access the property ladder.</p> <p>Therefore, we expect T &amp; M Council to fulfill their legal duty with respect to the NPPF guidance policies which are very clear that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Thereby adopting a strategic policy aimed at protecting the clear separation, and therefore identity, of local settlements such as Wateringbury &amp; adjacent settlements of Pizen Well &amp; Teston, known as an anti-coalescence policy.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>     |
| 42443361 | 0 5.11.14 | <p>We still need to extend the green belt boundary.</p>  | <p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p> |
| 42800097 | 0 5.11.14 | <p>Building up to the Nationally imposed housing target in TMBC area would not substantially affect the affordability of houses locally - it would just adversely affect the rural nature of the borough, add to pollution, travel times, overloading of facilities and general frustration. The affordability of housing locally (and nationally) should be addressed by providing financial and fiscal measures.</p>   | <p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>      |
| 42806945 | 0 5.11.14 | <p>Agreed further permanent additions to green belt would be a positive addition to protection of the environment.</p>   | <p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p> |
| 42824065 | 0 5.11.14 | <p>5.11.14</p> <p>The Greenbelt should not be built on when other land is available there is land encompassed by Ashton way which would be ideal as it could centre on the rail station and access is good for Motorway access. I believe this is not in the greenbelt. Planting areas with trees would soften the look of housing and provide lungs to mop up co2. Access to a rail station with good pavements and PROPER cycle paths would reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>This area along with the Eccles site making provision for the amount of water here with high flood proof building with lake views would be amazing. Think out of the box.</p>  | <p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered alongside national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.</p> |
| 42684641 | 0 5.11.14 |  |   |