| 1. SITE INFORMATION               |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Reference number                  | GT3-50                                    |
| Site name/address                 | Land at Kingswood Farm,                   |
| Landowner                         | Mr R Schroeder                            |
| Agent                             |   |
| Greenfield/PDL                    | Greenfield                                |
| Site area (ha)                    | 3.2ha                                     |
| Proposed no. of pitches           |   |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to    | Rural                                     |
| urban, rural settlement or rural  |   |
| Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites) | Call for Sites 2014. Site put forward for |
|                                   | Gypsy & Traveller use.                    |

| 2 SITE ASSESSMENT /SUITAR  | OTI TTV   |
|--|---|
| Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)  | The site plan originally submitted indicates agricultural fields situated to the north and north east of Kingsnoad Farm. Access to the adjacent properties of Kingsnoad Farmhouse and Owls Roost is via a long, unmade track. A PROW runs along this access track and to the south of the site. The site lies behind a tall hedge to the north of the public footpath.  To the east and north of the site lie fields while to the east lies Birch Wood. The area is rural in character. |
| Current use  | Residential and commercial  |
| Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)  | None  |
| Planning history  Landscape/townscape impact –   | 09/1368 – single storey rear extension to Kingsnoad Farmhouse. APPROVED 98/0564 – 2 storey side extension to Kingsnoad Farmhouse APPROVED 87/0014 – conversion of farm building to holiday accommodation APPROVED  The site is located within the Ulcombe Mixed   |
| including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening | Farmlands character area of the Landscape Character Assessment 2012. Key characteristics of this area include  • Undulating landscape with wide views • Scattered orchards and mixed woodland blocks  |

|   | <ul> <li>Isolated oaks trees within pasture and</li> </ul>  |
|---|---|
|   | mature oak hedgerows  |
|   | Limited arable land   |
|   | Field ponds   |
|   | <ul> <li>Liner settlements sand strong local</li> </ul>   |
|   | vernacular  |
|   |   |
|   | The condition assessment is Very Good and the sensitivity assessment is Very High   |
|   | The guidelines for this area are CONSERVE   |
|   |   |
|   | Views into the site are obscured by Kingsnoad Farmhouse itself and the high hedge which runs along the southern boundary of the site. There is a glimpsed view into a small part of the site via a break in the hedge close to the edge of the farmhouse. |
| 5 1 1 1 1 (1 00)  |   |
| Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI &                          | Sites is not within or adjacent to a SSSI or  |
| local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)        | a LWS.  |
| Trees (inc. TPO, ancient                                | Birch Wood adjoining the site to the east is  |
| woodland within and adjacent                            | a Planation on an Ancient Woodland Site   |
| to site)  | (PAWS)  |
| Agricultural land quality                               | Grade3  |
| Heritage impacts (Listed                                | None near or adjacent to the site   |
| building, conservation area)                            |   |
| Archaeology (SAM etc.)                                  | No SAMs   |
| PROW (within or near site)                              | TBC   |
| Access (Highways)                                       | Access would be via a very narrow,  |
| Site access     Impact on wider highway                 | unmade lane   |
| <ul> <li>Impact on wider highway<br/>network</li> </ul> |   |
| Access to main highway                                  |   |
| network   |   |
| Availability of public                                  |   |
| transport/walking/cycling                               |   |
| Access to services – distances                          | 4.1km away from Harrietsham Station   |
| from bus stop/rail                                      | 2.1km away from the nearest doctor's  |
| station/shop/GP/school                                  | surgery in Kingswood  |
|   | 6 bus stops within 1km of the site  |
|   | 1.3km away from the nearest school in   |
|   | Kingswood   |
| Impact on residential amenity,                          | While the site is large it would be adjacent  |
| impact on residential afficility,                       | Trime the site is large it would be adjacent  |

| including access to open space  | to Kingsnoad Farmhouse and close to the property Owls Roost.  |
|---|---|
|   | The site plan submitted does not show how the site would be accessed. It is not clear that there landowner has a right of access along the existing access track which serves the properties Kingsnoad Farmhouse and Owls Roost. If the site could be legally accessed via this route, the access into the site would pass directly infront of the front elevation of the farmhouse. This would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of this house by virtue of the disturbance from the passing vehicles and pedestrians. The creation of an alternative access route, if achievable, would require the loss of existing hedgerow and the creation of a new track across undeveloped fields to access the site. This would have an unacceptable impact on the visual and rural character of the area. |
| Utilities (availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g.  | There are existing services at the site.  |
| water/gas/electric)   | Not in a AOMA   |
| Air quality/noise   | Not in a AQMA   |
| Land contamination  | Unlikely Not in a Flood Bick Zone   |
| Flood Risk (zone/drainage)  Suitability (assessment conclusion) – is the site suitable in planning terms as a | Not in a Flood Risk Zone  A site visit was undertaken on 7 <sup>th</sup> November 2014 to assess the site's suitability as a Gypsy/Traveller site.  |
| Gypsy and Traveller Site?   | The site is located in a rural area. The PPTS does not preclude provision of Gypsy/Traveller sites in rural areas and therefore the site should not be discounted on this basis.  |
|   | The site is a relatively well screened with hedges at the front and trees at the east. The creation of a new access would have an unacceptable visual impact and use of the existing track (if in the control of the landowner) would cause unacceptable detriment to the amenity of the existing properties.   |

| Could the site be used for travelling showpeople? | No the roads are too narrow to accommodate heavy equipment such as fairground rides.   |
|---|--|
|   | Furthermore, a travelling showpeople site would have a greater visual impact than a Gypsy/Traveller site increasing the harm caused to the character of the area and nearby residents. |

| 3. AVAILABILITY                               |   |
|---|---|
| Is the whole site known to be                 | Yes Landowners have put the site forward. |
| available for Gypsy and                       |   |
| Traveller use?                                |   |
| <ul> <li>No existing uses</li> </ul>          |   |
| <ul> <li>Willing landowner</li> </ul>         |   |
| <ul> <li>Existing tenancy or lease</li> </ul> |   |
| agreement                                     |   |
| Availability conclusion                       | Currently available                       |
| ,   | ,   |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |  |
|---|--|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | Access to the site is not demonstrated |
| When could the site be delivered?   | Landowner has indicated 2012-2016      |
| Achievability conclusion  | unconfirmed                            |

The creation of a new access would have an unacceptable visual impact and use of the existing track (if in the control of the landowner) would cause unacceptable detriment to the amenity of the existing properties.

## **PITCH CAPACITY - 0**

| 1. SITE INFORMATION               |                                     |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Reference number                  | GT-3-51                             |
| Site name/address                 | Five Acres, Tilden Lane, Marden     |
| Landowner                         | Mr F Donaldson                      |
| Agent                             | Mr S Hawes                          |
| Greenfield/PDL                    | Yes                                 |
| Site area (ha)                    | 2.06ha                              |
| Proposed no. of pitches           | unknown                             |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to    | Rural, not adjacent to a settlement |
| urban, rural settlement or rural  |                                     |
| Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites) | Call for Sites                      |

| 2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITAR   | BILITY   |
|---|--|
| Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)   | The site is a large field with access onto Tilden Lane. The site has significant levels of fencing at the front and side boundaries while a line of large trees runs along the rear boundary.  A small breaker's yard is situated on the south eastern boundary while two storey semi-detached dwellings lie further away from the site to the west.   |
| Current use   | Agricultural land  |
| Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)   | None   |
| Planning history  | None but planning permission for a traveller site has been granted in the locality at 1, Oak lodge, Tilden Lane under Council's ref MA/12/1123 for 2 mobile homes.   |
| Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening | KEY CHARACTERISTICS Low lying gently undulating clay landscape of the Low Weald Small fields with orchards, pasture, ponds and watercourses enclosed by thick native hedgerows creating an intimate atmosphere Dominance of mature oak trees as imposing hedgerow trees and sometimes within fields where hedgerows have been lost Large scale open fields where hedgerows have been removed |

for intensive arable cultivation Sparse scattered small woodlands Winding roads with wide verges bounded by ditches and mixed native hedgerows Historic buildings scattered through the landscape and in the historic cores of Staplehurst and Marden

Condition Assessment Good Sensitivity Assessment High

- Consider the generic guidelines for the Low Weald
- Conserve the abundance of oak as a dominant species, and plant new isolated oaks within pasture and oak standards within hedgerows to replace ageing species
- Conserve and enhance the hedgerows, ensuring that they are correctly managed and gaps replanted
- Conserve the pastoral land and orchards and resist conversion to arable land
- Conserve and enhance the small scale field pattern and sense of enclosure, encouraging restoration and management of historic field boundaries
- Conserve the landscape setting of historic Settlements
- Conserve the largely undeveloped rural landscape and the remote quality of isolated farmsteads and hamlets
- Resist further linear development and intrusive elements along the A229
- Soften the visual prominence of large

|   | agricultural barns through native planting and encourage native hedgerows around commercial and housing developments                              |
|---|---|
|   | <ul> <li>Enhance habitat opportunities around<br/>water bodies and ditches by<br/>promoting and managing a</li> </ul>                             |
|   | framework of vegetation in these<br>areas   |
| Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)   | No  |
| Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)  | No  |
| Agricultural land quality   | Unknown   |
| Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)   | None  |
| Archaeology (SAM etc.)  | None  |
| PROW (within or near site)  | None  |
| <ul> <li>Access (Highways)</li> <li>Site access</li> <li>Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>Access to main highway network</li> <li>Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul> | Tilden Lane is not on a bus route and is very narrow with only room for 1 vehicle to pass at any one time.  |
| Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school  | <ul><li>1.1 miles from Marden Station</li><li>1.2 miles from Marden village which has a shops, a local GP surgery and a primary school.</li></ul> |
| Impact on residential amenity, including access to open space   | Residential properties on the opposite side of the road, site is located far enough away not to have any adverse impact.                          |
| Utilities (availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric)  | Residential properties opposite and therefore services likely to be available.  |
| Air quality/noise   | Not in an AQMA  |
| Land contamination  | Unlikely  |
| Flood Risk (zone/drainage)  | Flood Zone 3  |
| Suitability (assessment   | The site is located in Flood Zone 3 and is  |
| conclusion) – is the site suitable in planning terms as a   | therefore not suitable for a Traveller site unless a Flood Risk Assessment (FLA)  |
| Gypsy and Traveller Site?   | indicates otherwise. Allocation of this site would be contrary to the PPTS.   |
| Could the site be used for  | No  |

| travelling showpeople? |  |
|------------------------|--|

| 3. AVAILABILITY                               |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Is the whole site known to be                 | Yes                 |
| available for Gypsy and                       |                     |
| Traveller use?                                |                     |
| <ul> <li>No existing uses</li> </ul>          |                     |
| <ul> <li>Willing landowner</li> </ul>         |                     |
| <ul> <li>Existing tenancy or lease</li> </ul> |                     |
| agreement                                     |                     |
| Availability conclusion                       | Currently available |
| ,   | ,                   |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | None                              |
| When could the site be delivered?   | Landowner has indicated 2014-2016 |
| Achievability conclusion  | Achievable                        |

Site is unsuitable for allocation as a Traveller's site as it lies within an area at high risk for flooding.

## PITCH CAPACITY 0

| 1. SITE INFORMATION               |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Reference number                  | GT-1  |
| Site name/address                 | Congelow Farm, Benover Road, Yalding        |
| Landowner                         | B E Wingrove                                |
| Agent                             | N/A   |
| Greenfield/PDL                    | Greenfield                                  |
| Site area (ha)                    | Approx 1.2                                  |
| Proposed no. of pitches           | 20/30 pitches                               |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to    | Adjacent to settlement (40 metres)          |
| urban, rural settlement or rural  |   |
| Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites) | Call for sites (2014). Site was resubmitted |
|                                   | in 2014 as a potential Gypsy site having    |
|                                   | been previously considered in the 2013      |
|                                   | SHLAA for the same use                      |

| 2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY                                    |  |
|---|--|
| Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses) | The site is a large grass field sited on the eastern side of Benover Road approximately 40m south of Yalding. The north boundary is marked by a post and wire fence with some sporadic trees/hedging and beyond are open fields. No. 4 Benover Road is around 75m to the north and 'Maple Bank' is around 50m to the northwest. The east boundary is marked by post and wire fencing with open grass fields beyond and the River Beult is around 120m to the northeast designated as a SSSI.  To the south of the site is Congelow Farm which has a group of large agricultural buildings. Congelow Cottages (GII listed) are 60m to the southwest. The west boundary with Benover Road is marked by a 1m deciduous hedge. Opposite the site is the dwelling 'Congelow House' around 40m away. |
| Current use   | Grazing land   |
| Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)             | None   |
| Planning history  | 05/1636 - Creation of a vehicular access was approved.   |

62/0367/MK3 - Outline application for houses was refused.

60/0198/MK3 - Residential development was refused.

55/0191A/MK3 - The erection of dwellings was refused.

55/0191/MK3 - Outline application for the erection of detached dwelling house was refused.

Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening

The site is very large comprising of an open field with low level hedges running along the boundary with Benover Road. A line of trees runs along the northern boundary while a line of hedges runs along the eastern boundary granting view of the wider countryside.

The site is located within the Laddingford Low Weald area of the Landscape Character Assessment 2012. Key characteristics of this area include:

- Landscape forms part of the wider Low Weald landscape
- Low lying landform
- Intricate network of ditches, ponds and reservoirs
- Small and mostly broadleaf woodland blocks
- Orchards, hops and pasture surround settlements
- More expansive arable land within surrounding landscape
- Much linear settlement with clusters of development at road junctions

The condition assessment is *Moderate* and the sensitivity assessment *Moderate*.

The Guidelines for this area are to Conserve and Improve.

The site provides view of the wider country side and any development at the site would harm the character and appearance of the area.

| Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site) | Grazing land so low value. River Beult SSSI 120m to the northwest so would need KCC advice. Low to medium potential.  |
|---|---|
| Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)                  | N/A   |
| Agricultural land quality   | The site is Grade 2 or 3 agricultural land.   |
| Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)                           | Near to Congelow Cottages (GII listed). Conservation Officer advises that use of this site for gypsy and traveller pitches is likely to have an adverse effect on the setting of this group of listed buildings. The site also lies directly opposite Congelow House, a fine mid 19 <sup>th</sup> Century house which should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. Impact on the setting of this property would be especially severe. |
| Archaeology (SAM etc.)  | Historic parks and gardens assessment recommended to clarify the significance of Congelow House gardens.  |
| PROW (within or near site)  | Public footpath KM195 runs along the River Beult around 130m to the northwest.  |
| Access (Highways)   | Good access onto road approved in 2005. Within walking/cycling distance of Yalding village.   |
| Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school        | Bus stop: 170m to north Yalding train station: 2km (by road) Shop: 350m to north GP: 240m to north Primary school: 900m (by road)   |
| Impact on residential amenity, including access to open space                   | While residential dwellings are sited nearby it is considered that a small Gypsy/Traveller site would have a limited impact on the privacy and amenities of the neighbouring occupants providing that any proposal provided sufficient screening.   |
| Utilities (availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric)  | The site is near to the road and nearby houses so there is potential for services.  |
| Air quality/noise   | It was noted during the site visit that there   |

|   | is some traffic noise from Benover Road.<br>However, it is unlikely that traffic noise<br>would harm the amenities of any occupants<br>for the site.  |
|---|---|
| Land contamination  | Unknown (some potential from agriculture). This would need to be investigated if an application was to be submitted.  |
| Flood Risk (zone/drainage)  | The site falls within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore considered to unsuitable for a Traveller site. Allocation of the site would be contrary to the PPTS and the NPPF.  The Environment Agency has previous objected to any residential development of the site due to the flooding constraints. |
| Suitability (assessment conclusion) – is the site suitable in planning terms as a Gypsy and Traveller Site? | Due to location in Flood Zone 3, visual harm and potential harm to listed buildings, conclude that site is not suitable.  |
| Could the site be used for travelling showpeople?   | No due to flood risk  |

| 3. AVAILABILITY  |   |
|--|---|
| Is the whole site known to be available for Gypsy and Traveller use?  • No existing uses  • Willing landowner  • Existing tenancy or lease agreement | The application form would suggest so and there is no existing use. |
| Availability conclusion  | Currently available   |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |   |
|---|---|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | Flood risk assessment/contaminated land assessment but would not suggest any abnormal costs or constraints. |
| When could the site be delivered?   | Landowner has indicated 2012-2016   |
| Achievability conclusion  | Achievable  |

The site appears available and deliverable. However, any Gypsy/Travller site would harm the landscape and potentially impact on the setting of listed buildings. While it might be possible to mitigate this by the careful design of a small well screened site comprising of one/two plots the site is also within an area of high risk for flooding which cannot itself be mitigated against.

#### **PITCH CAPACITY 0**

### **Gypsy and Traveller Sites Assessment-Addendum**

| 1. SITE INFORMATION               |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Reference number                  | HO3-208                                     |
| Site name/address                 | Land Adjacent to Charlesford Avenue,        |
|                                   | Kingswood                                   |
| Landowner                         |   |
| Agent                             | John Keeley                                 |
| Greenfield/PDL                    | Greenfield                                  |
| Site area (ha)                    | 1.5ha                                       |
| Proposed no. of pitches           | Not Specified                               |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to    | Rural                                       |
| urban, rural settlement or rural  |   |
| Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites) | Call for sites (2014). Site put forward for |
|                                   | housing but the landowner also identified   |
|                                   | that if it did not prove suitable for       |
|                                   | housing, it may potentially be available    |
|                                   | for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.      |

#### 2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY

Suitability (assessment conclusion) – is the site suitable in planning terms as a Gypsy and Traveller Site?

The site has previously been assessed as unsuitable for bricks and mortar housing as it is subject to the following constraints:

- Ancient Woodland
- Tree Preservation Orders
- Designated Local Wildlife Site

The site is also constrained its designation as a safeguarded Area of Archaeological Importance

The land is subject of an Article 4 direction preventing the erection of fencing and enclosures along the boundary. Therefore boundaries between plots would have to be provided by planting and soft landscaping.

A site inspection was made on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2014 to assess the site's potential for a Gypsy/Traveller site.

The site is well located in terms of accessibility to local services and public transport and is not within a flood zone or near to any heritage assets.

|   | From the site inspection it is clear that there are no to mitigation measures that can be undertaken bring this site forward for development. |
|---|---|
| Could the site be used for travelling showpeople? | No the site is too constrained.   |

| 3. AVAILABILITY                               |  |
|---|--|
| Is the whole site known to be                 | No existing uses, landowner has indicated    |
| available for Gypsy and                       | on the Call for Sites form that the site may |
| Traveller use?                                | potentially be available                     |
| <ul> <li>No existing uses</li> </ul>          |  |
| <ul> <li>Willing landowner</li> </ul>         |  |
| <ul> <li>Existing tenancy or lease</li> </ul> |  |
| agreement                                     |  |
| Availability conclusion                       | Site is potentially available                |
|   |  |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |  |
|---|--|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | KCC Highways have identified that this site cannot forward without extension to Charlesford Avenue which would be costly and likely to render the site unviable.                 |
| When could the site be delivered?   | Unknown.   |
| Achievability conclusion  | Given the number of constraints that would need to be overcome together with the cost of extending the access, it is highly unlikely that delivery of this site can be achieved. |

The site has too many constraints that cannot be overcome and is therefore not suitable.

It is unknown whether the site is available.

## **PITCH CAPACITY 0**

### **Gypsy and Traveller Sites Assessment-Addendum**

| 1. SITE INFORMATION               |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Reference number                  | HO3-210  |
| Site name/address                 | Land at Butlers Farm, Horseshoes Lane  |
| Landowner                         | Clare White (part landowner)   |
| Agent                             |  |
| Greenfield/PDL                    | Part PDL predominantly Greenfield  |
| Site area (ha)                    | 9ha  |
| Proposed no. of pitches           | Not Specified  |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to    | Rural  |
| urban, rural settlement or rural  |  |
| Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites) | Call for sites (2014). Site was put forward for housing but the landowner indicated on the Call for Sites form that it could potentially be available for Gypsy & traveller accommodation if the site proved unsuitable for housing. |

## 2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY

Suitability (assessment conclusion) – is the site suitable in planning terms as a Gypsy and Traveller Site?

The site has previously been assessed as unsuitable for bricks and mortar housing on the grounds that it constitute an extension to the existing settlement, lack of local facilities and potential loss of Doctor's surgery.

A site inspection was made on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2014 to assess the site's potential for a Gypsy/Traveller site.

It was noted during the site visit that the site is particularly large with Butlers Farm close to the front boundary with Horseshoes Lane. The rear of the site is largely hidden from view from the road by the existing residential building and significant planting. There are glimpsed views of the eastern extent of the site through the hedgerow fronting Back Lane to the east.

The site has limited access to local services, although it is close to the GP practice and Langley has a community centre. However the PPTS does accept does not preclude locating Traveller sites in rural areas and therefore the site

should not be rejected on this basis. The site is not affected by environmental constraints relating to ecology, the heritage or flooding. The site comprises a substantial area of agricultural fields, currently planted as orchards. The site is bisected north/south by a public footpath and further public footpath spurs off to the east towards Back Lane. The site is fairly level and from the public footpaths there are both short views and medium range views across the extent of site. Whilst views are to an extent interrupted by intervening orchard trees, it is considered that a Gypsy site would be prominent in the landscape from public vantage points and would be harmful to the overall rural character of the area. Could the site be used for No - storage of equipment would have a greater adverse landscape impact travelling showpeople?

| 3. AVAILABILITY  |   |
|--|---|
| Is the whole site known to be available for Gypsy and Traveller use?  • No existing uses • Willing landowner • Existing tenancy or lease agreement | The landowner has confirmed that the availability of this land for a Gypsy & Traveller site is currently uncertain. |
| Availability conclusion  | Uncertain   |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |   |
|---|---|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | None identified                         |
| When could the site be delivered?   | Unknown                                 |
| Achievability conclusion  | Achievable subject to landowner consent |

• it is considered that a Gypsy site would be prominent in the landscape from public vantage points and would be harmful to the overall rural character of the area.

## **POTENTIAL PITCH YIELD 0**

## **Housing Sites Assessment Proforma -**

| 1. SITE INFORMATION                    |   |
|--|---|
| Reference number                       | HO3-218   |
| Site name/address                      | Eaglesham, Marley Road, Harrietsham                     |
| Landowner                              | Jenifer Esqulant  |
| Agent                                  |   |
| Greenfield/PDL                         | Greenfield  |
| Site area (ha)                         | 1.2   |
| Proposed yield                         | 3-4 Units with existing dwelling retained               |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to urban,  | Rural   |
| rural settlement or rural              |   |
| Site origin (call for sites/local plan | Call for sites 2014. The site was submitted for         |
| rep?)                                  | housing but the landowner indicated on the form         |
|  | that if the site proved unsuitable for housing it could |
|  | potentially be available for Gypsy & Traveller use.     |

| 2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABIL                                       | TTV   |
|---|---|
| Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses) | The site is located on the east side of Marley Road some 250m south of its junction with Pilgrims Way, and 280m north of its junction with Dickley Lane.                              |
|   | The site lies at the foot of the scarp slope of the North Downs ridge and Marley Road generally rises northwards towards the escarpment.  |
|   | The site is currently occupied by a detached bungalow with a number of single-storey outbuildings. The development is situated on the western side of the site.                       |
|   | Beyond the bungalow and outbuildings the land associated with the house falls in level eastwards as there is a valley that runs southwards from the Pilgrims Way towards Dickley Lane |
|   | Immediately to the north of the property is a detached dwelling in substantial grounds with a substantial wooded area adjacent to the site boundary.                                  |
|   | The Marley complex is located adjacent to the NE corner of the plot and this area of their site is currently being remodelled and swales and an infiltration basin constructed.       |
|   | The site is in the countryside outside a defined settlement but has no specific designation in the MBWLP 2000.  |
| Current use   | Residential   |
| Adjacent uses   | Residential (to north and south), Marley site (to the east) and equestrian (on west side of Marley Road).   |
| Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)             | None.   |
|   | The land on the west side of Marley Road opposite the site is within the Kent Downs AONB and the North Downs Special Landscape Area.  |

|  | Land to the east of the site lies within the Marley complex a designated employment site in the MBWLP 2000.  |
|--|--|
| Planning history   | None relevant on the site itself   |
| Line eite proviously been considered   | 12/1680 (LAND TO THE WEST OF MARLEY PLASTICS, ASHFORD ROAD, LENHAM, MAIDSTONE, KENT, ME17 2DE) - Provision of swales and an infiltration basin – Approved Subject to Cond.   |
| Has site previously been considered in Local Plan Inquiry, if so, record Inspectors recommendation | No   |
| Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long | Landscape Character Area No. 16. Harrietsham to Lenham Vale  |
| distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing screening                                   | <ul> <li>KEY CHARACTERISTICS         <ul> <li>Landscape to the north forms part of the Kent Downs AONB</li> <li>Topography slopes upwards to the north across the foothills and lower slopes of the North Downs</li> <li>Mosaic of mixed farmland divided by non rectilinear hedgerow boundaries</li> <li>Pocket of lowland dry acid grassland</li> <li>Small field pattern and equestrian grazing north of Harrietsham</li> <li>Series of drains running south, often defined by ribbons of native vegetation</li> <li>Blocks of native woodland</li> <li>Large scale industrial and commercial development</li> </ul> </li> <li>Condition Assessment Moderate         <ul> <li>Sensitivity Assessment Very High</li> </ul> </li> <li>SUMMARY OF ACTIONS</li> </ul>   |
|  | <ul> <li>Consider the generic guidelines for the Gault Clay Vale</li> <li>Harrietsham to Lenham Vale is partly situated within the Kent Downs AONB. The Kent Downs AONB is a nationally important designation which offers a high level of development constraint</li> <li>Land management policies for the conservation, management and enhancement of this landscape are set out within the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2009 – 2014. Also refer to guidance documents referenced in Appendix A</li> <li>Conserve the undeveloped foreground and rural setting of the Kent Downs AONB</li> <li>Conserve and appropriately manage the pocket of lowland dry acid grassland south west of Kiln Wood. Refer to Maidstone's local Biodiversity Action Plan Phase 1: 2009 – 2014 HAP 2 Lowland Dry Acid Grassland and Heath</li> </ul> |

| Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & local wildlife sites within or adjacent to site)   | <ul> <li>Conserve the mosaic field pattern and hedgerow boundaries, and restore further traditional boundaries where practicable</li> <li>Resist further agricultural intensification and maintain the separation between Lenham and Harrietsham</li> <li>Conserve the setting of traditional listed buildings and Conservation Areas</li> <li>Resist further development along the A20 corridor</li> <li>Resist further expansion of, or any new, industrial/commercial developments</li> <li>KCC Ecology</li> <li>House and well maintained garden. There are a number of mature trees within the site and some scrub to the east of the site. As a result of surveys carried out for MA/12/1680 It is known that reptiles, bats and breeding birds are present within the adjacent site. There is some suitable habitat for these species to be present within the site.</li> <li>Ecological constraint level 3</li> </ul> |
|---|---|
| Trees (inc. TPO, ancient woodland within and adjacent to site)  | Comments from Landscape team are as follows:  Tree protection status: Whilst there are no protected trees on site there are blocks of woodland to the north and east of the site together with a couple of significant individual trees to the east of the southern site boundary.  Ancient woodlands (from ' a revision of the Ancient Woodland Inventory for Maidstone borough, August 2012') There are no designated Ancient Woodlands.  Hedgerow status: It appears that there are no 'important' hedgerows.  |
| Agricultural land quality   | N/A   |
| Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)   | None  |
| Archaeology (SAM etc.)  | Not within a safeguarded Area of Archaeological Potential   |
| PROW (within or near site)  Access (Highways)  Site access  Impact on wider highway network  Access to strategic/main highway network  Availability of public transport/walking/cycling  Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school | Kent Highways comments No apparent serious problems, but isolated location  Officer comment Marley Road is narrow (one vehicle width) along this section of it. Passing spaces are provided by the entrances to the various dwellings and access point to fields along it.  GP Approx. 1.1km from site by road Village Hall approx 1.1km from site by road Harrietsham railway station approx 2.1km by road. Post office and village store approx. 1.7km and 1.5km by road respectively Harrietsham Primary school approx. 2.5km by road  |

|  | Bus service though Harrietsham village and along A20   |
|--|--|
| Impacts on existing residential amenity (including access to open space) | There would be some potential impact on existing amenity through increased traffic along Marley Road.  |
|  | The proposer has verbally indicated that they envisage three-four dwellings being erected to the east (rear) of the existing bungalow, which would be retained, with a new access road running along close to the northern site boundary. Use of this road may have an impact on the existing dwelling.  |
| Availability of utilities infrastructure –                               | Likely to be largely available due to existing   |
| e.g. water/gas/electric  | dwellings on Marley Road.  |
| Air quality/noise  | Not in an AQMA Noise unlikely to be a problem except possibly from the Marley complex.   |
| Land contamination   | Unlikely   |
| Flood Risk (zone/drainage)   | Not on Flood Zone 2 or 3 EA comments  Marden and Harrietsham Drainage Strategy We recommend a local drainage strategy be developed into which all the sites should contribute to, rather than each site considering site drainage independently. A local drainage strategy will likely result in a more efficient local drainage infrastructure. |
| Suitability (assessment conclusion)                                      | The site is not suitable for development due to its location relative to the settlement and its facilities.  The site is part of the setting of the Kent Downs   |
|  | AONB   |

| 3. AVAILABILITY  |   |
|--|---|
| Is the whole site available for the proposed use: e.g.  No existing uses Willing landowner Willing developer Existing tenancy or lease agreement | The proposer is the owner of the site They have indicated that the West Kent Housing Assoc have expressed an interest |
| Availability conclusion  | Potentially available   |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | None immediately apparent |
| Achievability conclusion  | Potentially achievable    |

| Timing (following assessment - when could the site be delivered?) |                                       |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| now - 2016  | Proposer has indicated this timescale |
| 2016 - 2021   |                                       |
| 2021 - 2026   |                                       |

2026 - 2031

#### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

Other than the existing dwellings together with a number of outbuildings the site is open in character and makes a positive contribution to the setting of the AONB. A new road would need to be created along the northern boundary of the site to gain access to the land at the rear of the existing dwelling. This, together with development required to facilitate provision of a Gypsy/Traveller site would have a detrimental impact on the AONB.

The site is part of the setting of the Kent Downs AONB

**REJECT** 

YIELD - 0

| 1. SITE INFORMATION   |   |
|---|---|
| Reference number  |   |
| Site name/address   | Land at Blossom Lodge, off Stockett Lane,<br>Coxheath |
| Landowner   | Roger Lee   |
| Agent   | N/A   |
| Greenfield/PDL  | Greenfield  |
| Site area (ha)  | Unknown   |
| Proposed no. of pitches   | 19 (including the 4 current pitches)                  |
| Is the site urban, adjacent to urban, rural settlement or rural | Countryside   |
| Site origin (e.g. Call for Sites)                               | Call for sites 2014 -site put forward for Gypsy use   |

#### 2. SITE ASSESSMENT/SUITABILITY

Site description (including topography and surrounding land uses)

The site is located on the south eastern side of Stockett Lane. The site is an existing Gypsy site with 4 mobile homes currently on site, 2 of which are currently unauthorised subject to the outcome of a current planning application (12/1209). The site is fairly level and is rectangular in shape, extending eastwards from the site's frontage to Stockett Lane. Access to the site is via a driveway which runs along the site's southern boundary. A public footpath diagonally crosses the western end of the site. To the west of this footpath is one of the mobile homes and a utility building, sited parallel to the northern boundary of the site. To the east of the footpath are the 3 further mobile homes (+ utility blocks). 2 of these are sited close to the southern boundary of the site and are the subject of the current application. The remaining mobile is sited parallel with the northern boundary.

To the north of the site is the existing Gypsy site Silverleas (permanent permission for 3 caravans) and to the east of that a cherry orchard. Adjacent to the south is the site Primrose Paddock (permanent permission for 2 mobiles) and beyond it to the east, a further orchard area. Due east of the Blossom Lodge site itself is an agricultural field. This field and a further field to the north which would

|   | create a 'dogleg' shaped site, are included in the Call for Sites submission. There are established hedgerow boundaries around the extent of the existing site. The fields further to the east are also enclosed by hedges.                        |
|---|--|
|   | The north east corner of the site is fairly exposed views over the site adjacent to a sewage works. This area appears to be used for grazing.  |
| Current use   | Existing Gypsy site with permanent permission for 2 mobiles. Current application (12/1209) for 2 further mobiles (sited parallel to the northern boundary of the site).  |
| Planning and other designations (AONB, greenbelt etc)   |  |
| Planning history  | 12/1209 - Change of use of land for the stationing of two additional mobile homes and utility blocks with associated hardstanding for gypsy family. Pending consideration  |
|   | 08/0671 - Change of use of land for the stationing of two mobile homes with associated hardstanding for gypsy family and erection of two utility rooms.  Approved 17/12/09   |
| Landscape/townscape impact – including reference to Landscape Character Assessment 2012 (inc. long distance views); cumulative landscape impact; existing | The site falls within the Farleigh Greensand Fruit Belt Landscape Character Area. The landscape is assessed as having high sensitivity and good condition with the recommendation to CONSERVE.   |
| screening   | It also falls within the Loose Greensand Orchards and Pasture detailed landscape character area. The key characteristics are  • Large areas of traditional orchards  • Farm buildings (modern and traditional)  • Native hedgerows and tree lines; |

Hamlet wood coppice Pimp's Court Farm Centre and dwellings Network of farm tracks Sunken lanes with earth banks Undulating landform The sensitivity is assessed as moderate and condition as good with the recommendation to CONSERVE & REINFORCE. The existing site is a well screened site with established hedgerow to the north and south which restricts views in and out of the site. Similarly, the hedgerow fronting Stockett Lane restricts views into the site from the road. Views into the site are limited to glimpsed views through the access point into the site which, for those in passing cars will be relatively fleeting. Closer range views will be obtained by walkers using the footpath which crosses the site. Such users will see the full extent of the site from this vantage point however longer distance views of it and from it are contained by the boundary hedgerows referred to above. The visual impact of the development will therefore be limited to the time it takes to walk across the site which is some 110 m in distance. There are views of the eastern 'dogleg' part of the site from the footpath as it crosses the cherry orchard to the north albeit they are partially filtered by the intervening trees. Ecological Impacts (inc. SSI & No designated sites. local wildlife sites within or KCC Ecology comments: adjacent to site) This site is regularly mown/grazed grassland with a number of buildings within the site. There are hedgerows within the site which should be retained but there is limited potential for protected/notable species to be present. Ecology constraint minimal potential for ecological impacts Trees (inc. TPO, ancient No trees or Ancient Woodland on or woodland within and adjacent adjacent to the site. to site)

| Agricultural land quality   | Grade 2   |
|---|---|
| Heritage impacts (Listed building, conservation area)   | None in the vicinity of the site.   |
| Archaeology (SAM etc.)  | No SAMs   |
| PROW (within or near site)  | PROW (KM49) runs from south west to north east along part of the western part of the site.  |
| <ul> <li>Access (Highways)</li> <li>Site access</li> <li>Impact on wider highway network</li> <li>Access to main highway network</li> <li>Availability of public transport/walking/cycling</li> </ul> | KCC Highways – no objection   |
| Access to services – distances from bus stop/rail station/shop/GP/school  | Approximately 0.6 miles to Coxheath Town Centre.  Coxheath has a medical centre, primary school and a range of local shops as well as a secondary school at Cornwallis.   |
|   | Bus stop - Stockett Lane  |
| Impact on residential amenity, including access to open space   | The site currently consists of a small Gypsy/Traveller site with other small scale Gypsy sites located to the south and north.  Due to the location of the site and the separation distances which could be maintained between any new pitches and their neighbours. It is considered therefore that any new site would have a limited impact on the neighbouring occupants, providing that sufficient landscaping was maintained |
| Utilities (availability of utilities infrastructure – e.g. water/gas/electric)  | The proximity of other nearby properties suggests that site is capable of being connected to water/electricity.   |
| Air quality/noise   | None Apparent   |
| Land contamination  | Unlikely  |
| Flood Risk (zone/drainage) Suitability (assessment conclusion) – is the site suitable in planning terms as a  | Flood Zone 1 EA – no objection  A site visit was undertaken on 11 <sup>th</sup> May 2015 to assess the site's suitability as a Gypsy/Traveller site.  |

| Gypsy and Traveller Site?                         |   |
|---|---|
|   | The indicative plan provide by Mr. Lee as part of the call for sites, shows the site being developed for approximately 19 pitches (including the existing pitches).   |
|   | However, this does not preclude the expansion of the existing Gyspy site. A smaller extension to the site would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area if well designed with sufficient landscaping. |
| Could the site be used for travelling showpeople? | No - A Travelling Showpeople site would have a too great visual impact and cause harm to the character of the area and nearby residents.  |

| 3. AVAILABILITY  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Is the whole site known to be available for Gypsy and Traveller use?  • No existing uses • Willing landowner • Existing tenancy or lease agreement | Available |
| Availability conclusion  | Available |

| 4. ACHIEVABILITY  |               |
|---|---------------|
| Identification of any abnormal costs or other constraints to development which would prevent or delay this site being delivered | None apparent |
| When could the site be delivered?   | immediately   |
| Achievability conclusion  | achievable    |

- Site has established boundary screening which limits views in to and out of the site
- Close range views from the PROW which crosses the site
- Space within the existing extent of the site for some additional mobiles.
- Proposed 19 pitches would create a very substantial single site.
   Additional mobile homes on the eastern extent of the site would be more prominent in medium range views from the PROW crossing the orchard to the north.
- Would need to maintain and enhance existing hedge boundaries.

Uncertainty regarding achievability of the site

PITCH CAPACITY – 6 additional pitches (including the 2 which are subject to a current application)

Accept