



BOXLEY PARISH COUNCIL
www.boxleyparishcouncil.org.uk

Beechen Hall, Wildfell Close, Walderslade, Chatham, Kent. ME5 9RU
☎ 01634 861237 ☉ clerk@boxleyparishcouncil.org.uk

Clerk Mrs Pauline Bowdery **Assistant Clerk** Mrs Melanie Fooks

A G E N D A

To All Members of the Council, Press and Public

There will be a meeting of the **Environment Committee** on **Monday 12 October 2015 at Beechen Hall, Wildfell Close, Walderslade**, commencing at 7:30pm when it is proposed to transact the following business:

- 1 **Apologies and absences** (7:30)
To receive and accept apologies for absence.
- 2 **Declaration of Interests, Dispensations, Predetermination or Lobbying** (7:31)
Members are required to declare any interests, dispensations, predetermination or lobbying on items on this agenda. Members are reminded that changes to the Register of Interests should be notified to the Clerk.
- 3 **Minutes of the Meetings of 14 September 2015 - DECISION** (7:32)
To consider the minutes of the meeting and if in order to sign as a true record (previously circulated).
- 4 **Matters Arising from the Minutes - INFORMATION** (7:34)
 - 4.1 Minute 2789/4.2 Bike barrier at Fitzwilliam Rd/Camomile Drive. A report from KCC H.W&T is awaited, the report will indicate the cost of purchasing and erecting a barrier. County Councillor Carter has been approached about contributing towards the cost.
 - 4.2 Minute 2789/4.3 Advertising boards at Roundwood roundabout. These were reported to MBC Planning Department and a response is awaited.
 - 4.3 Minute 2791/7.2 HGV parking on roads. The issue will be a motion for debate at the KALC AGM on 21 November 2015.
 - 4.4 Any other matters arising from the minutes not on the agenda.
- To adjourn to allow members of the public to address the meeting** (7:40)
- 5 **Planning Applications for Consideration - DECISION** (7:50)
To receive and decide on responses to planning applications (page 3).
- 6 **Planning Decisions, Appeals and Appeals Decisions - INFORMATION** (7:58)
 - 6.1 Lordswood Urban Extension to supply see report (page 3).
 - 6.2 14/503722/TPO TPO No. 1 of 1969: An application for consent to fell 1 no. Sweet Chestnut tree. APPEAL: Dismissed 18 Goldstone Walk, Boxley, Kent, ME5 9QB. Appeal dismissed
- 7 **Highways and Byways - DECISION** (8:05)
 - 7.1 Parking at Boxley Village Green see report (page 3).
 - 7.2 Weaving Street Speed Reduction request see report (pages 4-5).
 - 7.3 Redundant utility boxes on verges see report (page 5-6).
 - 7.4 Experimental Traffic Order, Sandling Road, Chatham see report (pages 6).
 - 7.5 Installation of hard standing/apron at Boxley Road noticeboard see report (page 6)

- 8 **Volunteer Groups - INFORMATION** (8:15)
To receive any reports from volunteer groups associated with the parish council (pages...).
- 9 **Policy and Procedures Review** (8:20)
None scheduled.
- 10 **Maidstone Local Plan - DECISION** (8:21)
10.1 To receive an update on the Walderslade/Lordswood urban boundary issue see report (page 6-7).
10.2 MBC Public Consultation. To consider the briefing note (new page number 1-11 after page 14) and formulate a response.
- 11 **Kent County Council Consultations** (8:35)
11.1 Street lighting see report (pages 7-8).
11.2 Highways and Transportation survey see report (pages 8-10).
12. **Matters for Information - INFORMATION** (8:45)
To receive any information.
12.1 Cobtree Manor Park Car Park (update). MBC has decided to charge £1.50 for any period between 7 am and 9.00 pm; with an option of a £40.00 annual season ticket.
12.2 Play area refurbishment see report (page 12).
13. **Draft Budget 2016/2017** (8:47)
Members are invited to submit projects for consideration for the draft budget see report (pages 13-14).
14. **Next Meeting** (8:52)
Next full environment meeting 9th November at Beechen Hall commencing at 7:30pm. Items for the agenda must be with the parish office no later than 5 October.

In view of the confidential nature (personal details and data) on the Enforcement item about to be transacted, it is advisable that the public and press will be excluded from the meeting for the duration of or part of the item.

- 15 **Enforcement and Section 106 updates from MBC** (8:53)
To receive a confidential update see enclosed.

Pauline Bowdery

Pauline Bowdery
Clerk to Boxley Parish Council

Date: 5th October 2015

In accordance with policy the meeting should close no later than 9:30pm but the Chairman has devolved powers to extend it by 30 minutes.

Items to be returned to agenda: Yelsted Lane request for Not Suitable for HGV signs Feb 2016. Legislation allows for meetings to be recorded by anyone attending. Persons intending to record or who have concerns about being recorded should please speak to the Clerk.

Supporting agenda papers for the Environment Committee Meeting 12 October 2015. The Chairman will assume that these have been read prior to the meeting. Councillors wishing to suggest changes to any policy or procedure document in this agenda should notify the office, in writing, at least three working days in advance of the meeting to allow details to be circulated at the meeting (or in advance if particularly contentious).

Item 5 Planning Applications for Consideration. Purpose of item: DECISION

15/507623/FULL Application for first floor side extension at 15 Brownelow Copse Walderslade ME5 9JQ. Deadline 15 October 2015

15/506071/LBC Listed Building Consent for alteration of side boundary wall involving removal of a short section to allow for vehicle access at Yew Trees House, The Street, Boxley, ME14 3DR. Deadline 13 October 2015

15/508064/TPO TPO application to 1no. Goat Willow, Hornbeam, Field Maple and 2no. Cherry – Coppice at 11 Sylvan Glade Walderslade Kent ME5 9PW. Deadline 23 October 2015

Item 6 Planning Decisions, Appeals and Appeals Decisions. Purpose of item: INFORMATION AND DECISION.

6.1 APP/U2235/W/15/3132364 and 14/2227572. Lordswood Urban Extension. Outline application with all matters reserved for residential development (approx. 89 dwellings) plus open space, biomass plant and access road.

The Public Inquiry starts on 13th October and will likely last until the 16th October. The parish council will be in attendance: 13th & 14th Cllrs Bob and Wendy Hinder; Clerk and Assistant Clerk 15th; Cllr Ivor Davies 16th.

Item 7 Highways and Byways. Purpose of item: Decision/guidance

Item 7.1 Parking at Boxley Village Green.

Clerk's Briefing Note: Cllr Smith raised this issue at the 11 September parish council meeting and asked that the situation be reviewed again.

The parish council has made numerous attempts to address this issue but with the ESO being unwilling to sell land and no other suitable land being available it has never progressed.

St Mary's and All Saints Church has recently had dialogue with a landowner and it hopes that it might be able to progress and fund the work but currently the talks with the landowner have been put on hold but the church hopes, at some point, that they will resume.

Visiting public (walkers), the Church and The Kings Arms would benefit from parking and in recent years the Church and public house has indicated that they need approximately 50 car parking spaces to be provided but again due to numerous issues this did not result in any action being taken.

The issues regarding the supply of parking are as follows:

- Lack of land.
- Lack of
- a shared vision between the parish council and other local organisations.
- Cost. Commensurate gain against expenditure. On-going costs and maintenance.
- Planning issues of having just a large car park in an AONB.

A previous, some time ago, decision of the parish council was to try to purchase a small triangle of land adjacent to the closed churchyard (the ESO sometimes rents it out as sheep pasture) for a green informal recreational area with approximately 20 car parking spaces. The vision that the, then, parish council had was for a small open area with possibly a picnic table and information boards on local walks. The use by the Church and Public House would be incidental.

Clerk suggestions that there is no further action and that the parish council waits for the outcome of the Church project.

Item 7.2 Weaving Street Speed Reduction request.

A Weaving Street resident is requesting that a 20 mph speed limit and speed reduction bumps are installed in Weaving Street.

Dear Mrs Hinder,

We are writing to you as our local Councillor.

As local residents in Weaving my husband or I walk every day during term time with our grandson to preschool in Weaving Village Hall, Weaving Street. To say that at times we and our grandchild are at some considerable risk from speeding traffic is an understatement, caused mainly from three problems.

Firstly, no pavement on an almost single track road. Secondly, a thirty mile an hour speed limit with no bumps to slow traffic and no road side warning of either the presence of a school or a park with an exit directly on to the road. This exit has traffic passing the exit no more than 24 ins from the road edge. Thirdly it can also be noted that at certain times of the day there are far more cars using the road as a rat run, avoiding the busy right hand turn from Provender Way onto Grovewood Road North towards Tesco's. Perhaps good signposting and school and pedestrian warning signs and a reduction in the speed limit would be a reasonable start to improving safety. It may also be a reasonable suggestion to place speed bumps either side of the park exit before a child gets killed !

Clerk's briefing report.

For your information in the past three years the parish office has probably had 2 or 3 comments about the speed along Weaving Street.

I cannot trace that KCC has recently changed its 20 mph speed limits around schools and despite many years of promises I have yet to see much action taken outside of the initial pilot areas.

A request has been placed on the KCC website (ref 171000) for a speed limit reduction and speed bumps.

Crash data. KCC's Transport Intelligence data shows that there has been one slight injury (e.g. whiplash sprains and minor lacerations) between May 2010 and Apr 2015 when two cyclists collided at Weaving St/Grove Green Rd junction.

Safety interventions. KCC investigations and recommendations for work are triggered by the number of people injured. The following information comes from KCC.

*In the case of the **fixed** safety cameras, there has to have been 3 people killed or seriously injured within a 1.5 kilometre stretch of road within the previous 3 years.*

*Or for **mobile** safety cameras which are operated from vans there has to have been 1 person killed or seriously injured within a 5 kilometre stretch of road within the previous 3 years.*

Speed Indicator Devices (SIDs). These are often suggested and they have drastically reduced in price in the past 5 years (a basic solar powered one can be obtained for approximately £1,500) however they can only be installed where there is a clear and direct sight line of a minimum of around 40 metres. It is likely that the only suitable place would be on the verge outside of WDJO but this would need further investigation. There is a lamp post near the site and KCC would need to give permission for anything on the lamp post (which might not be able to take the unit). KCC will require £250 to investigate the possibility. The Parish Council has a legal power to purchase such a device however further investigation into highway law and highway safety would need to be undertaken to ensure that any device would not cause a highway safety issue.

Speed watch. The parish council has a speed watch system which could be used by local volunteers to identify what the speed problem is or whether the narrowness of the road creates an illusion of speed. This information could be used in evidence to KCC. Currently the speed watch is no tin operation as no community volunteers came forward to use it.

Partnership Working. The parish council has in the past used some of its reserves, effectively bribing KCC to do highway work; the controlled crossing point outside of St John's School and the speed reduction (50 down to 40) on Boxley Road are the most recent examples. To cover the total cost of these works it had to approach County Cllr Paul Carter for some of his devolved highway budget and he will only release funds if the parish council can clearly prove a need. The parish council has done this in the past by galvanising the local community and raising a petition etc. However if the community does not become involved then the Parish Council does not generally pursue the issue. The parish council has also attended the Maidstone Joint Transportation Board Committee Meeting on numerous occasions to ask for funding and I have been monitoring this committee and from what I've seen there is relatively little funding available.

If the Parish Council wishes to release its reserves to ensure a speed reduction and speed bumps then County Cllr Paul Carter's devolved budget and match funding from the parish council will be the only option to achieve this request. Based on experience to get a 10mph reduction **without any speed bumps** will cost in the region of £9,000. **With speed bumps** I would guesstimate £20,000 to £22,000 and it is unlikely that the Police will allow a reduction in the speed limit without physical bumps to self-govern it. Boxley Road's speed reduction was only allowed after heavy lobbying and additional road markings being installed.

The Parish Council will have to first pay for KCC officers to investigate whether the project is feasible and this can cost around £1,000. The Environment Committee's Street Maintenance budget has already been allocated for the bike barrier project at Fitzwilliam Road (exact costs are awaited) and for the concrete apron at Boxley Road but the Committee can approach the Finance and General Purposes Committee for additional funding to pay for the initial investigation/design work if it has insufficient funds available.

Parish Council funding.

The Environment Committee can of course investigate this request and suggest that the same action that successfully got the crossing and speed reduction is undertaken but ultimately it is up to the Finance and General Purposes Committee to agree to release any reserves to pay for the project.

Boxley Parish Council obtains its funds from the public and any expenditure has to be within the law and it must act prudently. The general rule is that *the gain must be commensurate with the expenditure.*

Options

An easy way to start is a quick visit to the two pre-school groups (Grove Green and Weaving Village Halls) with a note sent out to the Scouts' parents. An article could be placed within the Downs Mail etc. This will identify if other people feel there is a need. At this time I would not suggest giving information on a SID.

Do a letter drop to all residents along Weaving Street (not the cul de sac ends) to see gain their views on a) whether there is a speeding issue and b) whether they would support action.

Investigate the possibility of a SID.

Do nothing as there is no history of personal injury crashes.

I would strongly recommend is that if this looks like going forward with speed bumps that a local meeting is held for residents along Weaving to be consulted. Speed bumps outside residential properties, even if they are there to save a child's life, is an emotive issue for some property owners.

Item 7.3 Redundant utility boxes on verges. INFORMATION

Members may remember a member of the public asking at a parish council meeting that an empty Open Reach utility box be removed from the verge on Chatham Road, Sandling. After investigation it was found that Open Reach, and probably other utility providers using such cabinets, would charge to do this. Due to this no further action was taken regarding this box, and the resident understands this, however an e-mail has been sent to County Councillor Paul Carter highlighting this issue and

pointing out that it is probably unfair for the tax payers to have to pay for the removal of these items as they deteriorate and become dangerous.

Item 7.4 Experimental Traffic Order, Sandling Road, Chatham. RATIFICATION

Maidstone Joint Transport Board (meeting 14/10/15) will consider a report requesting that this temporary order, which was put in place to stop the illegal HGV parking, is made permanent. In view of the positive remarks from residents and the fact that the HGV's problem has been eradicated the Clerk, having consulted the Cllr Wendy Hinder and Cllr Dengate, has written to the Committee supporting the request. **RATIFICATION REQUIRED.**

Bollards. KCC Highways is looking for a way to improve the current design of the bollards to allow some parking but still excluding HGV's.

Cycle route. Funding will be applied for in the next financial year to improve the footway and include a cycle path and as this is a registered cycle route it is likely to attract the necessary funding.

White direction arrow. This is being repainted black and if the temporary road traffic order is made permanent the arrow will be burnt off.

Item 7.5 Installation of hard standing/apron at Boxley Road noticeboard.

KCC's response regarding any work or installation on highway land (and this includes verges) requires the completion of various forms and the payment of £395 (including an administrative fee, capitalised fee and inspection fee). The parish council has three projects which require KCC Highway permission and it is investigating whether a single application for the 3 locations can be made thus saving £790.

Item 10 Maidstone Local Plan. Purpose of item: INFORMATION/GUIDANCE

Item 10.1 Update on the Walderslade/Lordswood urban boundary (e-mail 21.09.2015).

I write regarding the Parish Council's request for amendments to the Urban Boundary at Walderslade, to exclude the non-residential parts of Walderslade Woods and the land west of Gleamingwood Drive. I understand from your emails to Cheryl Parks that the Parish Council is concerned that the loss of the ALLI designation covering undeveloped land within the Urban Boundary may leave these areas less protected.

At present the northern edge of the Urban Boundary in the part of Walderslade within Maidstone Borough mirrors the Borough's administrative boundary and is contiguous with the Medway Urban Boundary. The southern edge of the boundary follows the built form and key roads. In general terms, the Urban Boundary appears to be clearly and logically defined. In terms of Medway Council's approach to their Urban Boundary, I can confirm that officers from Maidstone Borough Council met with counterparts in Medway last week to discuss a number of cross-boundary issues, and this item was on the agenda. Medway are currently gathering evidence to inform a review of their Urban Boundary, as part of their emerging Local Plan, and are yet to determine their approach to making any revisions.

Whilst the loss of the ALLI designation may remove one form of local policy protection, Beechen Bank and Tunbury Wood are designated areas of Ancient Woodland and therefore have a very high level of protection in national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework is very firm in this respect: "planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss" (paragraph 118).

It is considered therefore that the Urban Boundary remains appropriate, and the Council is satisfied that the Ancient Woodland designation affords adequate protection to these areas.

Kind regards

Item 11 Kent County Council Consultations. Purpose of item: DECISIONS

Item 11.1 Kent County Council Consultation (e-mail 21.09.15).

Street Lighting. Clerk's note: This consultation has been advertised in the Downs Mail, website etc. In view of the concern over street lighting it is suggested that members respond to this consultation. Individual councillors are encouraged to respond as private citizens. For your information there is conflicting information on whether the part-night lighting has increased crime or not. The latest information from the Government is that there has been no discernable rise in crime figures. The document is available from the KCC website or can be supplied electronically from the parish office on request.

You've been invited to participate in the **Street Lighting** consultation by the consultation manager, Anne Wynde. This consultation is open from 21 Sep 2015 at 01:00 to 29 Nov 2015 at 23:59.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to inform you of the launch of Kent County Council's Street Lighting Consultation. The public consultation provides information on why we are switching to LED street lights and seeks the views of residents, businesses, communities and other stakeholders on whether they would prefer the current level of service of part-night lighting, or all-night lighting. We are also seeking feedback on the dimming of street lights when roads are less busy.

The consultation launches today and runs for ten weeks until the 29th November 2015.

You have previously expressed an interest in receiving information on consultations regarding Community Safety, Traffic, Transport & Roads and General Interest. Therefore you may be interested in this one

Consultation questions – italics indicate a comment from Clerk.

Q1. Are you completing this questionnaire on behalf of: *Response Parish Council.*

Q1a. If you are responding on behalf of a Council/Business/VCS organisation, please tell us the name of the organisation: *Response Boxley Parish Council*

Q2. The options for street lighting are outlined in the consultation document (page 5). Please indicate which option you would prefer. Option 1: Part-night-lighting - the current level of service
Option 2: All-night lighting

OPTIONS FROM PAGE 5

1. Part-night lighting – the current level of service Under this option, street lights are switched off between the hours of 12.00 midnight and 05.30 Greenwich Mean Time (01.00 and 06.30 British Summer Time). When the lights are converted to LED the annual savings could be around £5.2m. Of the two options this will generate the most savings and is considered to be the more cost effective option as it reduces the likelihood of financial cuts being made to other services. Turning lights off also reduces light pollution
2. All-night lighting When the lights are converted to LED the annual savings for an all-night lighting approach could be around £4.8m. This means that it would cost the County Council £400,000 more each year to provide all-night lighting, increasing the likelihood of financial cuts being made to other services. Leaving the street lights on all night may reduce people's fear of crime but it will also increase light pollution.

Dimming Along with the options above we are seeking your views on the dimming of streetlights when the roads are less busy (for example, late evening and early hours of the morning). This could provide additional energy and financial savings. Other authorities with LED street lights have found that dimming light levels by 30% - 50% is a reasonable approach. For example, if we dimmed the lights by 40% between 12 - 5.30am under all night lighting operation (Option 2), then this would reduce the potential £400,000 cost by approximately £160,000 a year.

Q3. Do you think it's a good idea to dim street lights when the roads and footways are less busy, for example, late evening and early hours of the morning? *Members must decide the response*
Q3a. Please add any supporting comments here: Late evening, e.g. 8pm to midnight Overnight, e.g. midnight to 5am Early morning, e.g. 5am to 8am, if dark Yes No Don't know

Q4. We have completed a draft Equality Impact Assessment for the street lighting options. An EqIA is a tool to assess the impact any policies or strategies would have on race, age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, sexual orientation, religion or belief and carer's responsibilities. We welcome your views. The EqIA can be accessed via kent.gov.uk/streetlights or on request from streetlighting@kent.gov.uk. Please add comments below: *Response either: No comment or members must decide the response.*

Q5. Would you like to make any further comments on the options for street lighting? Please add comments below: *Response suggested: Boxley Parish Council has, in recent years, noted a drastic drop in the level of service for repairing street lights. This is probably the major issue for residents.*

Q7. As part of the consultation, we will be looking to invite a small number of residents to take part in some workshop events and focus groups to discuss their views in further detail. Would you be interested in taking part in one of these discussion sessions? *Members must decide the response, either Yes or No*

Item 11.2 Kent County Council Highways and Transportation Survey 2015 (e-mail dated 16/09/15).

*Clerk's note: KCC has reverted to a paper consultation, due to problems encountered by many parishes last year. As Clerk I have used some common sense to **suggest** some responses and parish councillors who regularly report faults etc. may wish to amend or add to them.*

Consultation response.

Key points:

- Please select one answer option per question only
- Please submit only one (consolidated) response per Parish or Town Council
- Deadline: **Friday 27th November**

Section 1 – Contact with Kent County Council

Q1 Has your Parish or Town Council contacted *Kent County Council* to ask for information or report a problem with roads, pavements, street lighting or drains in the past 12 months?

Yes

Q2 If this was in relation to **roads**, how satisfied or dissatisfied were your Parish or Town Council with the service they received and why was this?

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied Dissatisfied

Very dissatisfied Don't know

Lack of information and communication on issues reported and length of time taken to have an answer. It will take 5 or 6 chases (even more) to get some form of information.

Information placed on the KCC website is often completely wrong or misleading. Jobs are recorded as completed when they are not, under investigation for months and there are rarely any phone calls from officers.

Messages left on voice mails are only returned 50% of the time and the parish office is often passed from pillar to post.

Q3 If this was regarding **pavements**, how satisfied or dissatisfied were they with the service they received and why was this?

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied Don't know **Non applicable**

Q4 If this was regarding **street lighting**, how satisfied or dissatisfied were they with the service they received and why was this?

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied Don't know Non applicable

Please see answer to Q2. In addition is KCC actually repairing any street lights? The parish office has ... Lights that it has reported which many are recorded as work completed but which do not work and some have not worked properly for years.

Q5 If this was in relation to **drains and gullies**, how satisfied or dissatisfied were they with the service they received and why do they think this?

Very satisfied Satisfied **Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied** Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied Don't know Non applicable

Q6 If this was in relation to **anything else**, how satisfied or dissatisfied were they with the service they received and why was this?

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied Don't know Non applicable

Q7 Regarding the **overall service** provided to your Parish or Town Council by *Kent County Council*, do they have any ideas on how we can improve the service?

Don't put false information on the website. If someone has reported a fault then contact them after the work is done and ask if, for instance, the light is working now and only then update the website. An automated response to the resident/parish council that work has been completed could be used.

Q8 Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were your Parish or Town Council with the service provided by their *Highways District Manager/Steward*?

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied **Dissatisfied**
Very dissatisfied Don't know

Lack of communication from both is the reason for dissatisfaction.

Q9 Has your Parish or Town Council any comments regarding the service provided to them?
See responses to above questions.

Q10 Did your Parish or Town Council attend one of *Kent County Council's* Annual Highway Parish Seminar this autumn?

Yes

No – go to Question 13

Don't know

Q11 If yes, how satisfied were your Parish or Town Council with the Seminar overall?

Very satisfied Satisfied Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied Don't know

Q12 If yes, have they any ideas regarding how we can improve the Seminar?

Section 2 – Condition of roads, pavements, street lights and drainage in Kent

Roads

How satisfied or dissatisfied are your Parish or Town Council with the *condition* of each of the following in their local area:

Q13 Residential or estate roads

Very satisfied			
Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied		Don't know	

Q14 Main 'A' or 'B' roads:

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied		Don't know	

Q15 Town centres or village roads:

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied	Don't know	Non applicable	

Q16 Country lanes:

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied	Don't know	Non applicable	

Q17 Does your Parish or Town Council have any views on the *condition* of roads or ideas to improve them?

Many of the country lanes and residential roads are down to the sub surface (no tarmac) or have rutted lines and potholes which are dangerous for users, especially pedestrians and cyclists. The safety critical and measurement policy is too extreme resulting in a lack of repairs etc.

Pavements

How satisfied or dissatisfied are your Parish or Town Council with the *condition* of each of the following in your local area:

Q18 Pavements on residential or estate roads

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied	Don't know	Non applicable	

Q19 Pavements in town centres, villages residential or estate roads

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied	Don't know	Non applicable	

Q20 Have they any views regarding the condition of pavements?

Street Lighting

Q21 How satisfied or dissatisfied are your Parish or Town Council with street lighting in their local area?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied	Don't know	Non applicable	

Q22 Have they any views on street lighting?

Repair the ones you own. The Parish Council is responding to the Street Lighting Consultation.

Drains and Gullies

Q23 How satisfied or dissatisfied are your Parish or Town Council that road drains and gullies are cleaned in their local area?

Very satisfied Satisfied **Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied** Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied Don't know Non applicable

Q24 Do they have any views or comments?

Section 3 – Congestion

A key action for *Kent County Council* is to provide consistent journey times to enable people to plan their trips. This means we will identify and tackle congestion 'hotspots' to improve journey time reliability.

Q25 Please could your Parish or Town Council list up to three congestion 'hot spots' (i.e. roads or junctions) which in their opinion frequently contributes to journey time unreliability:

Members must decide the responses

Hotspot number 1: Road name or junction: Town or village name:
Time of day (i.e. peak am/pm or *off-peak* am/pm):
What do they believe is causing this congestion?:

Hotspot number 2: Road name or junction: Town or village name:
Time of day (i.e. peak am/pm or *off-peak* am/pm):
What do they believe is causing this congestion?:

Hotspot number 3: Road name or junction: Town or village name:
Time of day (i.e. peak am/pm or *off-peak* am/pm):
What do they believe is causing this congestion?:

Section 4 – Improving road safety in Kent using safety cameras

Safety cameras (sometimes known in the media as speed cameras) are installed **as a last resort** and **even then** strict guidelines have to be met.

In the case of the **fixed** safety cameras, there has to have been 3 people killed or seriously injured within a 1.5 kilometre stretch of road within the previous 3 years.

Or for **mobile** safety cameras which are operated from vans there has to have been 1 person killed or seriously injured within a 5 kilometre stretch of road within the previous 3 years.

Q26 Does your Parish or Town Council agree or disagree that safety cameras are helping to make roads safer across Kent?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree
Strongly disagree Don't know

Q27 Why do they think this?

Section 5 – Improving the Highway Service

Q28 Are there any other local issues that your Parish or Town Council would like to bring to our attention?

KCC appears to have given up trying to provide a service and now only reacts to statistics and tick boxes. Issues regarding quality of life (and driving) receive no funding and it

appears that common-sense and understanding is not acceptable. This makes KCC inflexible and unable to effectively engage with communities. For example poor vegetation maintenance means that street signs, street lights etc. are obscured for most of the year which is unsafe. Requests for work at specific areas go unheeded and KCC did not cut back over hanging branches on a cycle route when this was requested.

Item 12 Matters for Information Purpose of item: INFORMATION/GUIDANCE

- 12.2 Play area refurbishment. The KM has reported that five play areas in the borough will be upgraded within the next financial year (it is not clear whether it is this or the next financial year). Timber Tops has been named as one of the five.

Item 13 Draft Budget 2016/2017 Purpose of item: DISCUSSION

INCOME

Ref .	Description	Cod e	Budget 2015/16	Forecast income to 31/03/16
	Drawn from reserves or precept			
Total			0	0

EXPENDITURE

Ref .	Description	Cod e	Budget 2015/16	Forecast income to 31/03/16
3.1	Coach tour	30	375	0
3.2	Street maintenance	109	3,500	3,500
3.3	Roundabout maintenance	108	308	308
Total			3,808	3,808

Forecast budgets

	Forecast income 2016/17	Forecast income 2017/18	Forecast income 2018/19	Forecast income 19/20

% increase

	Proposed budget 2016/17	Forecast exp 2017/18	Forecast exp 2018/19	Forecast exp 2019/20
	380	0	385	0
	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
	314	320	327	333
	3194	2,820	3212	2,833

2.8

Priority
Important
Desirable
Desirable

Supporting information and forecast plan.

As the Parish Council has Power of Competency it could, if the RFO wished, remove the legislation section of this document. However this information will prove valuable to the Assistant Clerk during her training and so it is being retained.

Budgets are classified, by the RFO and committee, with a 'rating'; Essential (also shown with a black code box with white writing), Important and desirable. Essential is normally expenditure required by legislation or expenditure that if stopped will have unacceptable impact on the parish council or its services.

3.1	LGA 1972 s 150	Coach Tour. On average takes place every two years. Generally in May later if an election year. Due to Local Plan issues extra tour might be needed 2015/16
-----	----------------	---

3.2	Various (Parish C Act 1957, s1:RTR Act 1984 s72 etc.)	Street maintenance including barriers, signs, litter etc. Env. Committee has an agreed policy/procedure/projects for allocating the budget. No budget to be spent without these being followed.
3.3	Various (Parish C Act 1957, s1:RTR Act 1984 s72 etc.)	Round Wood roundabout maintenance

Item 10.2 Maidstone Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation. Briefing Note 02/10/2015

MBC notification (e-mail 20/09/2015)

Dear Councillor,

Maidstone Borough Council is consulting on selected aspects of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan. The Local Plan is the council's principal planning document which sets the framework to guide the future development of the borough to 2031. The sections included in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 (October 2015) consultation relate to the following:

- *New, amended and deleted housing sites*
- *New employment site*
- *New Gypsy & Traveller sites*
- *New public open space policy and open space allocations*
- *Deleted Park & Ride sites*
- *Landscapes of Local Value*
- *New policy for care homes*

The Maidstone Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 (October 2015) can be viewed and downloaded from the council's website www.maidstone.gov.uk/localplan and is available for inspection at Maidstone Gateway, King Street, Maidstone, Kent ME15 6JQ. The Gateway is open Monday to Friday 09.00 to 16.30 (17:30 Monday). Copies of the document may also be purchased from Maidstone Gateway or arrangements for purchase and postage made through emailing ldf@maidstone.gov.uk Copies of the document will also be available for inspection at all public libraries in Maidstone Borough during normal opening hours and a hard copy has been sent by post to each Parish Council in advance of the start of the consultation.

Any person or organisation may make representations on the document and these will be considered before developing the Maidstone Borough Local Plan further. Those wishing to make representations are encouraged to use the council's web based consultation system.

Representations relating to the Maidstone Borough Local Plan Regulation 18 (October 2015) can be returned as follows:

(1) Online using the council's web based consultation system at:

<http://maidstone-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

(2) By email using the council's comments form to: ldf@maidstone.gov.uk

(3) By post using the council's comments form to: Spatial Policy, Maidstone Borough Council, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone, Kent ME15 6JQ.

*Representations that are made in writing (including electronically) to the addresses specified in (1), (2) or (3) by **5pm on Friday 30 October 2015** will be considered.*

Clerk's note. The relevant sections of the document will be produced below with a summary of any facts that might help members consider the impact on the parish. Facts may include extracts from the MBC document or from previous discussions or issues raised at Parish Council meetings. To aid member's consultation of the original document page and paragraph numbers will be included where possible.

Underlining of a sentence within a paragraph is by the Clerk to highlight a particularly relevant section.

To ensure members understand where the information originates the following titles/structures may be used:

- MBC LP = Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan consultation document.
- Clerk's note = may be a fact or reminder.

- ENV = something discussed or highlighted by or at an Environment Committee meeting.
- | |
|--------------------|
| Suggested response |
|--------------------|
-  = start of as new policy section

MBC LP Index.		BPC report page
1. Introduction to the public consultation	1	1-2
2. Policy SP5 - amendments relating to landscape and landscapes of local value	3	2-5
3. Proposed new housing site allocations	11	5-6
4. Housing site allocations proposed for deletion	79	6
5. Housing site allocation proposed for amendment	84	6-7
6. Proposed new employment site allocation	89	7
7. Proposed new Gypsy and Traveller site allocations	95	7-8
8. Proposed new open space allocations	114	8
9. Open space and recreation	136	8-10
10. Nursing and care homes	140	10
11. Park and Ride site allocations for deletion	141	10-11
12. Policy DM15 Park and Ride	144	11
13. Sustainability Appraisal	145	

Summary MBC LP (page 2)

1.7 New allocations for strategic natural and semi-natural open space are proposed for consultation, and the policy for publicly accessible open spaces has been revised to include new open space

1.8 The countryside policy has been reproduced so that consultation can be undertaken on the revisions to the criteria for landscape and landscapes of local value.

1.9 A new policy for nursing and residential care homes is has been drafted for consultation, in order to address an increasing demand for elderly accommodation over the time frame of the local plan.

1.10 Revisions to allocations for park and ride services are proposed, including the deletion of services previously allocated at Linton Crossroads and at the M20 motorway junction 7.

 MBC LP (page 3 onwards)

Policy SP5 - amendments relating to landscape and landscapes of local value

The countryside

(Page 3) 2.2 The countryside is defined as all those parts of the plan area outside the settlement boundaries of the Maidstone urban area, rural service centres and larger villages with defined settlement boundaries and is depicted on the policies map. The countryside has an intrinsic value that should be conserved and protected for its own sake. However there is also a need to ensure a level of flexibility for certain forms of development in the countryside in order to support farming and other aspects of the countryside economy and to maintain mixed communities. This needs to be mitigated in a way that maintains and enhances the distinctive character of the more rural parts of the borough.

(Page 5) Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting

2.13 A large part of the northern part of the borough lies within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This is a visually prominent landscape that contributes significantly to the

borough's high quality of life. It is an important amenity and recreation resource for both Maidstone residents and visitors and forms an attractive backdrop to settlements along the base of the Kent Downs scarp. It also contains a wide range of natural habitats and biodiversity. Designation as an AONB confers the highest level of landscape protection and one which the Council has a statutory duty to conserve and enhance ¹. Within the AONB, the Management Plan provides a framework for objectives to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. The Council has adopted the Management Plan and will support its implementation. Open countryside to the immediate south of the AONB forms the setting for this designation. In Maidstone this is a sensitive landscape that is coming under threat from inappropriate development and is viewed as a resource that requires conservation and enhancement where this supports the purposes of the AONB.

2.16 The above considerations apply equally to the setting of the Kent Downs AONB. The Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-2019 states that the setting of the Kent Downs AONB is 'broadly speaking the land outside the designated area which is visible from the AONB and from which the AONB can be seen, but may be wider when affected by intrusive features beyond that.' It makes it clear that it is not formally defined or indicated on a map. *Clerk's note: the above current definition of the setting of the AONB rules out the plateau area around the AONB. Members may wish to put forward this area for Landscapes of Local Value see paragraph 2.19.*

(page 6) 2.17 The foreground of the AONB and the wider setting is taken to include the land which sits at and beyond the foot of the scarp slope of the North Downs and the wider views thereof. It is countryside sensitive to change, with a range of diverse habitats and landscape features, but through which major transport corridors pass. Preservation and enhancement of this area is also part of the Council's statutory duty and is covered under the guidance set out in national policy (National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance). However, proposals which would affect the setting of the AONB are not subject to the same level of constraint as those which would affect the AONB itself. The weight to be afforded to potential impact on the setting will depend on the significance of the impact. Matters such as the size of proposals, their distance, incompatibility with their surroundings, movement, reflectivity and colour are likely to affect impact. The Kent Downs AONB Management Plan advises that 'where the qualities of the AONB which were instrumental in reasons for its designation are affected, then the impacts should be given considerable weight in decisions. This particularly applies to views to and from the scarp of the North Downs.' It is considered therefore that it is not necessary to formally define the setting of the Kent Downs AONB and that the impact of development can be appropriately assessed through the criteria of the policy.

(Page 6) **Landscapes of local value (LLV)**

2.19 The Council will seek to protect or enhance its most valued landscapes. The Kent Downs AONB and High Weald AONB and their settings and other sites of European and national importance are considered to be covered by appropriate existing policy protection in the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and other legislation. As well as this national policy guidance and statutory duty, the settings of the Kent Downs and High Weald AONBs are also afforded protection through the criteria of policy SP5 and no additional designation is therefore necessary. In addition to these areas, the Borough does include significant tracts of landscape which are highly sensitive to significant change. Landscapes of local value have been identified and judged according to criteria relating to their character and sensitivity:

- i. Part of a contiguous area of high quality landscape;
- ii. Significant in long distance public views and skylines;
- iii. Locally distinctive in their field patterns, geological and other landscape features;
- iv. Ecologically diverse and significant;
- v. Preventing the coalescence of settlements which would undermine their character;
- vi. Identified through community engagement;

¹ s85 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

- vii. Providing a valued transition from town to countryside.

Clerk's note: The LLV recognised in this plan are The Greensand Ridge, Low Weald and the Medway, Loose and Len river valleys.

Areas of Local Landscape Importance (ALLI) are no longer part of the local plan however MBC has identified the areas which it considers are highly sensitive to significant change. Looking at the criteria I would suggest that the plateau area around Lidsing, Beechen Bank and possibly Cowbeck Woods qualify for inclusion in the list.

ENV – has raised concern about the loss of the ALLI status for Beechen Bank and Lidsing Area.

(page 7) **Policy SP5 The Countryside**

The countryside is defined as all those parts of the plan area outside the settlement boundaries of the Maidstone urban area, rural service centres and larger villages defined on the policies map.

1. Provided proposals do not harm the character and appearance of an area, the following types of development will be permitted in the countryside:
 - i. Small-scale economic development, including development related to tourism and open-air recreation, through:
 - a. The re-use or extension of existing buildings except in isolated locations;
 - b. The expansion of existing businesses; or
 - c. Farm diversification schemes;
 - ii. Small-scale residential development necessary to:
 - a. Meet a proven essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work;
 - b. Meet a proven need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; or
 - c. Meet local housing needs;
 - iii. The winning of minerals; and
 - iv. Development demonstrated to be necessary for agriculture or forestry.
2. Where proposals meet criterion 1, development in the countryside will be permitted if:
 - i. The type, siting, materials and design, mass and scale of development and the level of activity maintains, or where possible, enhances local distinctiveness including landscape features; and
 - ii. Impacts on the appearance and character of the landscape can be appropriately mitigated. Suitability and required mitigation will be assessed through the submission of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments to support development proposals in appropriate circumstances.
3. The loss of local shops and community facilities which serve villages will be resisted. In all cases, another beneficial community use should be sought before permission is granted for the removal of these facilities;
4. Proposals will be supported which facilitate the efficient use of the borough's significant agricultural land and soil resource provided any adverse impacts on the appearance and character of the landscape can be appropriately mitigated;
5. The distinctive character of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its setting, the setting of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the extent and openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt will be rigorously protected, maintained and enhanced where appropriate;
6. The Greensand Ridge, Medway Valley, Len Valley, Loose Valley, and Low Weald as defined on the policies map, will be protected, maintained and enhanced where appropriate as landscapes of local value;
7. Development in the countryside will retain the setting of and separation of individual settlements; and

8. Natural assets, including characteristic landscape features, wildlife and water resources, will be protected from damage with any unavoidable impacts mitigated.
Account should be taken of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan and the Maidstone Borough Landscape Character Guidelines supplementary planning document.

Suggested response:

Boxley Parish Council considers that Policy SP5 Countryside paragraph 6 dealing with Landscapes of Local Value should include:

Country side around Lidsing.

This is a substantial tract of undeveloped land which is adjacent to the North of the Kent Downs AONB scarp. This area prevents the coalescence of the Medway Towns and Lordswood/Walderslade area and has sweeping long distance views, for instance to the Thames Valley and skylines. The area has scattered settlements, small woods and stands of trees which are characteristic of Kentish rural countryside and which is extremely sensitive to change.

It is considered that this area meets parts i, ii, iii, v, vii of the criteria for LLVs. The recent objection from the community relating to the Lordswood Urban Extension planning application indicates that there would be community support for a LLV thus ensuring part vi would be met.

Beechen Bank. *Clerk's note do members wish Walderslade Woods and Cowbeck/Reeds Croft Woods included?*

A prominent area of wooded landscape set on a steep sided slope which is the only long distance view of the five wooded valley's that form Walderslade (meaning wooded valley). The public view and skyline is a dominant feature in the area and as Ancient Woodland is highly sensitive to any change. Beechen Bank forms part of a band of original Ancient Woodland running from Wouldham in the East to Thurnham and beyond in the West. The Ancient Woodland preserve evidence of thousands of years of human activity in the countryside.

It is considered that this area meets parts i, ii, iii, v, vii of the criteria for LLVs.

Clerk's note an appropriate and similar section can be included for the other woods.

(Page 11) **Proposed new housing site allocations**

- Policy H1(51) Bridge Industrial Centre, Wharf Road, Tovil
- Policy H1(52) Dunning Hall (off Fremlin Walk), Week Street, Maidstone
- Policy H1(53) 18-21 Foster Street, Maidstone
- Policy H1(54) Slencrest House, 3 Tonbridge Road, Maidstone
- Policy H1(55) The Russell Hotel, Boxley Road, Maidstone
- Policy H1(56) Land at 180-188 Union Street, Maidstone
- Policy H1(58) Tovil Working Men's Club, Tovil Hill, Tovil
- Policy H1(59) Bearsted Station Goods Yard, Bearsted
- Policy H1(62) Land at Boughton Lane, Loose and Boughton Monchelsea
- Policy H1(63) Land at Boughton Mount, Boughton Lane, Boughton Monchelsea
- Policy H1(66) Land south of The Parsonage, Goudhurst Road, Marden
- Policy H1(68) Land to the north of Henhurst Farm, Staplehurst
- Policy H1(70) Land at junction of Church Street and Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea
- Policy H1(71) Lyewood Farm, Green Lane, Boughton Monchelsea
- Policy H1(72) Land adjacent to The Windmill PH, Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne
- Policy H1(73) Brandy's Bay, South Lane, Sutton Valence
- Policy H1(74) Wren's Cross, Upper Stone Street, Maidstone
- Policy H1(75) Land north of Heath Road, (Older's Field), Coxheath
- Policy H1(76) Hubbards Lane, Boughton Monchelsea
- Policy H1(77) Bentletts Yard, Laddingford

ENV: Concerns about additional traffic from developments just outside the parish.

Clerk's note: Within this section there are no sites identified in the parish. Development just outside the parish boundary, which may have a knock on effect (underlined above), have in them a

statement in the policy Community Infrastructure. Appropriate contributions towards community infrastructure will be provided where proven necessary.

Note see paragraph 5.2 below.

Suggested response: Boxley Parish Council would like to make a general statement on the issue of housing and infrastructure. The draft proposed new housing site allocations state's *Community Infrastructure. Appropriate contributions towards community infrastructure will be provided where proven necessary.* MBC has yet to adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy or the Integrated Transport Strategy and it is vital that these happen before the Local Plan is finally approved and planning applications start to be submitted for the many sites.

(Page 79) **Housing site allocations proposed for deletion**

Haynes, Ashford Road, Maidstone. Tongs Meadow, West Street, Harrietsham
Ham Lane, Lenham Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea

Suggested response: None.

(Page 84) **Housing site allocation proposed for amendment**

5.2 Following an assessment of the representations received through the consultation process, and consideration by the council's Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee in January 2015, the council's Cabinet on 2 and 4 February 2015, and finally the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transport Committee on 18 August 2015 the site is recommended for re-consultation for the reasons indicated.

5.3 The site is indicated on the attached plan for ease of reference and the revised policy included below.

Policy no. H1(10)

Site location. South of Sutton Road, Maidstone

Reason for proposed amendment.

The site policy is to be amended to read that the site should be included in the plan for up to 800 dwellings.

MBC LP Policy H1 (10) South of Sutton Road.

Clerk's note: Below is the relevant transport and infrastructure part of the policy.

Community infrastructure

17. Appropriate contributions towards community infrastructure will be provided, where proven necessary.

Highways

18. Safe connections will be made to the existing cycle network from Park Wood to the town centre and through the upgrading of PROW KH364 and KH365.

Strategic transport requirements

19. Allocations H1(5), H1(6), H1(7), H1(8), H1(9), H1(10), H1(21) and H1(22) are subject to strategic transport requirements as part of the south east strategic housing location. These allocations will contribute, as proven necessary, towards the following;

- i. Bus priority measures on the A274 Sutton Road from Willington Street to the Wheatsheaf junction;
- ii. The improvement of the Willington Street / A274 Sutton Road junction;
- iii. A new roundabout to be provided on the A274 to allow access to Langley Park site;
- iv. A new access road of a width suitable to accommodate contra-flow traffic and adjacent footways between Gore Court Road from the western boundary of Bicknor Wood and A274 Sutton Road:

- v. Widening Gore Court Road to a suitable width to accommodate contra-flow traffic with a footway on the eastern side of the carriageway between White Horse Lane and the access into the North of Sutton Road site;
- vi. A pedestrian and cycle crossing on the A274 to link the allocated development sites; and
- vii. Strategic road infrastructure to significantly relieve traffic congestion on Sutton Road and Willington Street.

An individual transport assessment for each development, to be submitted to and approved by the Borough Council in consultation with Kent County Council as the highway authority and the Highways Agency, where appropriate, will demonstrate how proposed mitigation measures address the cumulative impacts of all the sites taken together.

ENV: Concerns about additional traffic from developments just outside the parish.

Suggested response:

The draft policy state's *Community Infrastructure. Appropriate contributions towards community infrastructure will be provided where proven necessary.* MBC has yet to adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy or the Integrated Transport Strategy and it is vital that these happen before the Local Plan is finally approved and planning applications start to be submitted for the site.

There is particular concern about the impact on traffic movements along New Cut Road and Bearsted Street. The Grove Green residential area only has access/egress onto New Cut Road and with planned development (over 70 dwellings at the Maidstone Studio site) there are currently periods of significant congestion which can only worsen. Additional development at the Sutton Road site will increase traffic movements through the Grove Green area and whilst this policy highlights the highway improvements needed immediately around the site it does not deal with the knock on effect on the infrastructure close to the M20. The Parish Council asks that MBC notes this concern and ensures that the issues raised are taken up in the draft



(Page 89) **Proposed new employment site allocation**

Policy EMP1(5) Woodcut Farm *Clerk's note: Junction 8 M20.*

MBC LP (page 90) ENV – has expressed some concern about knock on traffic effects.

6.13 Vehicular access to the site will be taken from the A20 Ashford Road and a Transport Assessment will identify the scope of improvements required to the junctions (and associated approaches) at:

- the M20 Junction 8 (including the west-bound on-slip and merge);
- the A20 Ashford Rd/M20 link road roundabout;
- the A20 Ashford Rd/Penford Hill junction;
- the A20 Ashford Rd/Eyhorne Street/Great Danes Hotel access; and
- the Willington Street/A20 Ashford Rd junction.

6.14 The site is located on a bus route (A20) but without significant additional dedicated measures it is highly likely that workers and visitors travelling to and from the site will be highly reliant on their private cars. A Travel Plan will be required to demonstrate how development will deliver significantly improved access by sustainable modes, in particular by public transport but this could also include cycling, walking and car share initiatives.

Suggested response: Members to decide any response.

(Page 95) **Proposed new Gypsy and Traveller site allocations**

Clerk's note: There are none proposed for the parish.

Suggested response: Members to decide any response.

(Page 114) **Proposed new open space allocations**

Clerk's note: There are none suggested for the parish however there is the following request.

(Page 135) **Request for additional open space allocations**

Landowners who wish to promote further sites for inclusion as strategic land allocations of publicly accessible natural or semi-natural open space are invited to submit proposals, including a site plan, for consideration as a representation to this consultation.

Clerk's note: The Wildfell Close Planning Application includes a request for change of use to open space but it is not clear whether it would be wise for KCC to submit this area.

(Page 136) **Policy DM11 - Open space and recreation**

9.1 High quality, publicly accessible open space can bring about opportunities for promoting social interaction and inclusion in communities. Sports and recreation areas and facilities can contribute positively to the well being and quality of those communities. Open space can also have a positive impact upon the quality of the built environment and can be of ecological value. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the provision and retention of high quality open spaces, a stance that the council supports.

Part of 9.4.....

Priorities for the improvement to existing spaces will be set out in the Action Plan to the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.

ENV – has concerns about the lack of play facilities in the parish villages and also Walderslade Woodlands areas and this has been taken up in the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.

9.5 The council will produce an Open Space Supplementary Planning Document to provide further detail to support the policy, including qualitative open space standards.

Policy DM11 <u>Publicly accessible open space and recreation</u>		
1. For new housing or mixed use development sites, the council will seek to deliver the following categories of publicly accessible open space provision in accordance with the specified standards:		
i. Quantity standards		
Open space type	Draft standard (ha/1000 population)	Minimum size of facility (ha)
Amenity green space	0.7	0.1
Provision for children and young people	0.25	0.25 excluding a buffer zone (but in cases where accessibility to children's and

		young peoples provision is poor, for example outside a reasonable walking distance or where the crossing of major roads is necessary, smaller areas of open space may be justified on site).
Publicly accessible outdoor sports	1.6	To meet the technical standards produced by Sport England or the relevant governing bodies of sport.
Allotments and community gardens	0.2	0.66
Natural/semi-natural areas of open space	6.5	0.2
<p>ii. Quality Standards All new open spaces must take account of design and accessibility and other quality requirements specific to each open space type set out in the Open Space SPD. An Open Space Layout and Design statement, to incorporate ecological management measures, should be submitted for approval by the Council.</p>		
<p>iii. Accessibility Standards If open space cannot be provided in full on development sites, due to site constraints, housing delivery expectations on allocated sites, or location, then provision should be provided off-site where it is within the distance from the development site identified in the accessibility standard.</p>		
Open space type	Accessibility standard (radius from open space)	
Amenity green space	400m	
Provision for children and young people	600m	
Publicly accessible outdoor sports	1000m	
Allotments and community gardens	1000m	
Natural/semi-natural areas of open space	300m (2ha site) 2km (20ha site) 5km (100ha site) 10km (500ha site)	
<p>2. A financial contribution in lieu of open space provision will be acceptable, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposed development site would be of insufficient size in itself to make the appropriate new provision; or ii. The open space cannot be accommodated on site due to site constraints, housing delivery expectations on allocated sites or location, and alternative appropriate off-site provision cannot be identified. <p>3. Where it can be demonstrated that existing open space provision can either wholly or partially mitigate the impacts of development in accordance with the above standards, the Council may seek a reduced contribution.</p>		

4. Proposals for, and including, new publicly accessible open space and recreation will, where feasible, seek to reinforce existing landscape character, as defined in the Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment.

5. Proposals for, and including, new publicly accessible open space and recreation provision shall respect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, by ensuring that development does not result in excessive levels of noise or light pollution. New lighting relating to such development will also preserve the character and visual amenity of the countryside.

6. Proposals for new development which would result in the net loss of open space or sport and recreation facilities will not be permitted unless there is a proven overriding need for the development. In addition, the development will only be permitted if:

- i. There is no resulting deficiency in open space or recreation facilities in the locality; or
- ii. An alternative provision, determined to be of an equivalent community benefit by officers of the Council and community representatives can be provided to replace the loss.

7. In dealing with applications to develop existing open areas within the urban area, rural service centres, larger villages and other locations, the Borough Council will have regard to the impact of the loss of the contribution that the existing site makes to the character, amenity and biodiversity of the area.

The Open Space supplementary planning document will contain further detail on how the policy will be implemented.

Clerk's note: Members' attention is drawn to the MBC's initial recommendation, when considering the Maidstone Studio dwellings, for the section 106 contribution for open space to go to the Penenden Heath play area. When challenged by the parish council, who wished for it to go to Weaving Heath/Grove Green, MBC decided on allocating it to facilities within (and this will need checking) 1 kilometre of the site.

ENV – Had concerns about the distances residents, especially with very young children, were expected to travel to play facilities.

Suggested response: Boxley Parish Council wishes to see the inclusion of a statement concerning where any financial contribution towards off-site provision is spent. Any such contribution should be used to improve/upgrade the local facilities rather than any further afield.

(Page 140) **Nursing and care homes**

Policy DM42

Nursing and care homes

Within the defined boundaries of the urban area, rural service centres and larger villages, proposals for new nursing and residential care homes through new build, conversion or redevelopment and for extensions to existing nursing and residential care homes which meet the following criteria will be permitted:

1. The proposal will not adversely affect the character of the locality or the amenity of neighbouring properties by means of noise disturbance or intensity of use; or by way of size, bulk or overlooking; and
2. Sufficient visitor and staff vehicle parking is provided in a manner which does not diminish the character of the street scene.

Suggested response: Members to decide.

(Page 141) **Park and Ride site allocations proposed for deletion**

Policy Reference	Site location	Reason(s) for deletion
PKR1(1)	Linton Crossroads	Negative impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, notably the Greensand Ridge, which outweighs the transport benefits.
PKR1(2)	<u>Old Sittingbourne Road</u>	<u>Landowner has indicated the land is no longer available for Park and Ride use</u>

Env – Maidstone Studios use the P&R for the large events at the studio so this will have a knock on effect for residents at Grove Green.

Further development at the Nottcutts and hospital area would have relied on the P&R for their green travel plans etc.

(Page 12) **Policy DM15
Park and Ride**

1. The following sites, as defined on the policies map, are designated bus Park and Ride sites:
 - i. London Road (to serve the A20 west corridor);
 - ii. Willington Street (to serve the A20 east corridor);
2. The provision of new or replacement Park and Ride facilities should meet the following criteria:
 - i. Satisfactory access, layout, design, screening and landscaping;
 - ii. Provision of suitable waiting and access facilities and information systems for passengers, including people with disabilities; and
 - iii. The implementation of complementary public transport priority measures both to access the site and moreover along the route. Measures will include dedicated bus lanes (including contraflow lanes where appropriate), together with bus priority measures at junctions.

Suggested response: Members to decide any response.

Clerk's note: Members' may wish to make a response (separate to this consultation) to MBC about the loss of the site and need for a replacement/impact on the surrounding area due to Maidstone Studios using the facility as the studio car park is now going to be built on.