

From: John Carpenter  
Subject: Re: Maidstone Borough Council - Inspector's Interim Findings  
Date: 30 December 2016 at 21:04:08 GMT  
To: Louise St John Howe <louise@poservices.co.uk>

Good evening Louise.

Thank you for forwarding the above.

Regarding H1 (55) The Inspector, despite having asked me specifically at the Hearing on the alternative exit routes from the sites, appears to have ignored my response and the fact that all routes lead to the A229.

The Inspector has also ignored the KCC comment at the same Hearing that they had stated their objection to ALL southern allocation sites due to the traffic impact on the A274 and A229.

The Inspector has ignored the evidence put to him on the lack of sustainability of the site due to inadequate services in the village.

And the Inspector ignores the Southern Anti-coalescence Belt, the harm to the character and amenity of the setting and everything else that I presented to him and the constraints that all previous Inspectors have themselves found prohibitive of development in this location on all previous occasions.

The Inspector asked at the Hearing if a possible point of access had been found without destroying hedges - it has not.

The Inspector was made aware of but ignored Kent Highways statement that the proposed access to the site was a conflict between road safety and planning desires.

I take hope from this interim note not being the final outcome, as that infers there is still time for wrongs to be righted and errors to be rectified, so please ask the

Inspector to look again at the H1 (55) site allocation and everything discussed at the Hearing and in my representations to him, as he clearly has missed numerous points of factual evidence put to him and come to the wrong conclusion.

Should I write formally or is the above adequate?

I would be more than happy to discuss directly if the Inspector wishes it.

Best wishes and a Happy New Year to you.

John Carpenter