

---

<b>Platt</b> Borough Green And Long Mill	<b>562309 157506</b>	<b>07.06.2005</b>	<b>TM/05/01766/FL</b>
--	----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

Proposal:	Construction of 20 dwellings for social housing with associated parking, access and landscaping
Location:	Land Adjacent Glebe Lodge Maidstone Road Platt Sevenoaks Kent
Applicant:	Russet Homes Limited

---

## **1. Description:**

- 1.1 This application proposes the provision of 20 units of affordable housing on a site within the Green Belt between the A25 and the railway line in Platt. The application is in detailed form and proposes 14 semi-detached dwellings, 2 detached dwellings and 4 flats. The new units would feature conventional two storey height buildings with gabled pitched roofs and traditional brick and tile materials. The development would be carried out at a density of 27.4 dwellings per hectare. (The applicant submits that because part of this site would be used for a new footpath and banked screening that the developable area is actually 0.66 hectares and so 30 dph is achieved).
- 1.2 The new dwellings would be arranged to the north, south and east of a new access road that would enter the site approximately midway between the Platt school and Pine View accesses. Each of the detached and semidetached houses would be provided with two car parking spaces. The flats would be served with a parking area to accommodate seven parking bays (one for each unit and three for use by visitors).
- 1.3 To protect the aural amenities of the new properties the applicant proposes to erect a new 1.8m high acoustic fence along the site frontage and to screen this and the wider development by enlarging an existing bank situated along that frontage and enhancing the planting along that banking. The application includes proposals to provide a new footpath to the front of the site along the A25.
- 1.4 In order to enable the new access road and housing to be developed, it would be necessary to alter the existing landform of the site, principally through cutting into the land to create a reduced level. In many places the site will need to be reduced by approximately 2m in height.
- 1.5 The application has been supported by the following documents:
  - A supporting planning statement including an updated position on the original 2001 Platt Housing Study.
  - A soil/ground investigation.

- A design statement.
- A noise assessment.
- An ecology/wildlife survey

## **2. The Site:**

- 2.1 The site is formed by an area of land situated outside of the confines of Platt that is designated as open countryside and MGB. The land was once allotment gardens but has naturalised with various shrubs, bracken and young trees. The densest vegetation is found on an embankment along the site frontage and along its rear boundary with the railway.
- 2.2 The site sits between the A25 and the London to Ashford railway and between the residential properties of Holly Cottage and Glebe Lodge. In topographical terms, the land is elevated above the carriageway of the A25 and rises notably from that southern side up to its northern boundary. (Beyond that boundary the railway sits in a steep cutting of varying depth to a maximum of approximately 15m).

## **3. Planning History:**

- 3.1 None relating to this site. However, planning application TM/03/03647/OA that related to a nearby site, also in the Green Belt, is relevant insofar as that application included proposals to provide affordable housing for Platt. The justification/housing needs survey submitted with this application uses the survey carried out for TM/03/03647/OA as its base data.

## **4. Consultees:**

- 4.1 PC: The Parish Council supports the application. It acknowledges that the proposal has attracted a significant amount of local opposition and understands the concerns about the continued “urbanisation” of the part of Platt that abuts the A25, increased traffic and strains on infrastructure. However, the PC considers that it must be borne in mind that the area within the limits of the settlement (i.e. south of the A25) is in principle open to housing development and that it is likely to happen, e.g. on the Brickmakers’ Arms site and in connection with the approval for a new school, the Parish Council has accepted the consequence of houses in place of the present school buildings. The PC do not find that the 20 Affordable Homes proposed would be the final straw for local infrastructure — based upon the assumption that the inhabitants will already be local people. The PC would wish to see any development of sympathetic design and with adequate parking provision.

The PC shares the anxiety of objectors about preserving the integrity of Green Belt but believes that because the housing is proposed on a rather insignificant piece of land contiguous with existing housing that does not afford any sort of view and

does not bear an ALLI designation. It finds that although housing would have been incongruous on the field opposite the Brickmakers' Arms, this consideration does not apply here.

Previously, the PC has been rather doubtful about the statistical basis of the conclusions derived from the Housing Needs Survey pointing to a local housing need and the whole issue of local need. However, the PC now has a better understanding of the current Borough and local situation relating to affordable housing and also notes that the Borough has endorsed the survey conclusions insofar as a grant has been approved. In the light of these considerations, the PC bows to the Council's expertise on housing need.

The PC now believe that there must be people living in the parish within the categories covered by policy P6/7 of the TMBLP who cannot afford to buy. It concludes that it is essential for the future vitality of what it would like to see as a mixed and inclusive community that Affordable Housing be provided (there is very little left of that deriving from the 1950's). These comments have been made on the understanding that the new houses would be for rent only, with no right to buy, and with priority given to Platt people in perpetuity. The PC believes that this current opportunity to provide rented housing is unlikely to occur again and that it should be taken.

On the detail of the design, the PC has no major concerns but wonders whether the two 4 bedroomed houses should have an extra parking space each. On access and highway matters, the PC believes that this aspect needs to be given careful consideration. The A25 is very busy and there is a view of oncoming traffic for only about 100 meters in each direction. Pine View is nearly opposite.

(NB – this is a summary of the PC's response. A copy of the PC's full correspondence is available for inspection).

DHH:

#### Refuse Storage/Collection

There may be a need for parking restrictions at the entrance to the site, the sharp bend and the turning area to ensure access/ egress for the refuse freighter.

#### Housing

As you will recall, Housing Services supported the earlier application and judged the survey (which sought to justify the 'exceptional case' for releasing land in the green belt) and its methodology to be acceptable. I am aware, however, that since that time a number of local objectors have questioned the veracity of the study and

that advice was sought from the applicant on the concerns raised. As this advice has now been received I have re-examined the study to satisfy myself (having not been involved in the earlier analysis) of the validity of its findings.

While the provision of affordable housing for local communities is a corporate priority, we must be especially careful on exception sites to make sure that the methodology adopted and the subsequent findings are sufficiently robust to justify releasing green belt land.

Although the survey does not appear to follow best practice (which from my research indicates that a 100% survey of the parish should have been conducted), I am of the opinion that a degree of housing need does exist in Platt. This is particularly the case when adjacent parish needs are also taken into account – permissible in appropriate circumstances under planning policy 6/7. In addition, the local housing list also identifies a level of demand for affordable housing in Platt.

In summary, I am happy that the survey indicates the existence of a level of housing need but the extent to which need in Platt alone can be accurately identified is not absolutely clear. Nevertheless, taking into account all the circumstances it would seem reasonable to conclude that the overall position taken on the need for affordable housing by the Council in connection with the previous application would appear to be appropriate.

### Noise

The acoustic appraisal (Peter Moore, 18 May 2005) shows that the unprotected site is in NEC C of Local Plan Policy P3/17. For sites in NEC C permission “will not normally be granted.” The appraisal then assesses the effect of various mitigation measures. The combined effect of these measures, which are summarised in section 7 of the report, make the proposal acceptable:

- The nearest building to the railway, which is at the west end of the site, should not have bedroom windows directly facing the railway. They should only have a sideways aspect to it, and be at least 4 metres from the boundary fence.
- There should be no bedroom windows facing the railway that are closer than 6 metres from the boundary fence.
- A 1.8 metre high solid fence or wall must be constructed to shield houses at the south of the site from road traffic noise.
- In the case of the building closest to the road at the east end of the site, it is necessary for the bedroom windows to only have a sideways aspect to the road and to be at least 11 metres from the kerb.

- Sound insulation measures in Noise Exposure Category B comprise an acoustic grade of glazing for bedroom windows facing the railway or the road, with the ceilings of those rooms constructed with a double layer of plasterboard. Acoustically screened mechanical ventilation is required for bedrooms facing the road.

It appears that the following issues, identified in Peter Moore's report (ref 050302) dated 18 May, have not been addressed:

- There is no acoustic fence or wall on the Maidstone Road frontage.
- The bedroom windows to unit 20 are less than 11 metres from the kerbside.
- There are no details of the sound insulation to be provided to dwellings in NEC B.

It will therefore be necessary for the applicant to amend the application to incorporate deal with these issues.

#### Land Contamination

Submitted details comprise a report on ground investigation (report ref. D7467X dated June 2005) at land opposite Pine View, Platt, prepared by Evans + Langford for Russet Homes. The report presents the 'Phase 1 Desk Study and Phase 2 Intrusive Ground Investigation.

I have the following observations:

I understand that the above report is submitted in order to satisfy the minimum requirement for the determination of planning application TM/05/01766/FL and the report is fit for this purpose.

While report section 8.11 recognised the presence of ash in topsoil, Benzo (a) pyrene remains absent in contaminant suite. Further intrusive investigation should consider this chemical.

I understand that generic assessment criteria has been used in the report and in some areas the level of contaminant failed the mean value test (as for example Hg) that will trigger appropriate remedial measures.

The report section 8.13-8.17 indicates the possibility of hotspots that need to be identified through further investigations, which I agree.

So, if permission is granted, the standard land contamination condition (three-stage conditions following PPS 23, Annex 2 section 2.62) should be imposed.

- 4.2 DL: It is noted that the proposals provide the sufficient area of land required under Policy P8/2 for the provision of children's playing space (15m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling).

It will be essential that this play space is designed appropriately and potential conflicts with the surrounding land users are taken into consideration. Of particular concern is the potential for conflict with the occupiers of Unit 16 and the boundary between the play space and the driveway to units 17-20. The Plan has indicated some type of boundary around the play area. Clarification on the specification of this would be useful.

The applicant should also show that future maintenance of the play -space has been considered and secured.

I have no comments to make on the Ecology Survey.

- 4.3 KWT: The Trust has no reason to question the findings of the Protected Species Risk Assessment.

- 4.4 KCC (Highways): Maidstone Road (A25) is a Primary Distributor road and therefore Policy T19 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996 applies. This states that 'Development will normally be refused which involves the construction of a new access onto the primary or secondary road network, or the increased use of an existing access directly onto that network, where an increased risk of accidents or significant traffic delays may result'.

Traffic Generation: TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) suggests that a single dwelling for rent will generate in the order of between 7 and 8 arrival and departure movements per day. Therefore, this proposal of 20 dwellings are likely to generate approximately 140 to 160 movements. This is likely to result in an additional 12 to 14 movements during the peak times.

The existing site is derelict with no known use. Therefore, there is no off set in traffic movements and all traffic generated by the proposal will result in additional movements on the public highway.

Parking: The proposal is a mixture of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses and flats. 2 in curtilage spaces are being provided for the houses and are acceptable. The flats are being provided with 1 space each plus 1 visitor space. KCCVPS would require for flats 1 space per unit plus 1 per three for visitor parking. However, for 2 bedroom units it would look for a maximum of 2 spaces per unit i.e. in this instance 8 spaces. I would find as a balance the provision of 1 space per unit plus 2 visitor spaces. I believe that the 1 additional space could be located between the dedicated parking and the visitor space with the footpath access being relocated around the end of the existing visitor space.

Access: It is proposed to provide a new access to serve the proposal. To accord with Kent Design, the width of the residential road is to be a minimum of 5.5m for the first 20m with footways on both sides. The radii scale in the order of 10.5m and are acceptable. The submitted plan shows forward vision of 90m x 4.5m x 90m and accords with the requirements for a junction onto this category of road and within a 30mph speed limit.

Other matters: The local authority operates a back edge of public highway refuse collection service. It is likely that the flats will require a temporary refuse bin store close to the boundary for collection day. It is also likely that a temporary store may be required to serve Units 17, 18 19 and 20. It is unlikely that the refuse freighter will reverse up the private shared drive. The applicant will need to confirm refuse collection with the local authority.

Surface water from private areas is not to discharge onto the public highway.

All works put forward for adoption will be in accordance with Kent Design and be subject to a legal agreement.

The applicant is reminded of the requirement for the submission of a Stage 1 and 2 Safety Audit. The acceptance of the submitted layout does not preclude the possibility of amendments being required following the Safety Audit procedures.

The applicant will need to submit lighting details for consideration.

Summary: Although I am satisfied that suitable on site parking, turning and access can be provided, I would raise concerns over the traffic generation and its likely impact on safety and the free flow of traffic on the Maidstone Road (A25), a Primary Distributor route. All generated traffic movements will be additional with no offset for any existing or potential use. Indeed, the site does not benefit from an existing vehicle access onto Maidstone Road. The proposed access is in close proximity to Pine View and Platt CE Primary School. The school generates on street peak time parking with the associated pedestrian movements that include young children. To introduce additional turning manoeuvres, particularly during the peak times, onto a very busy Primary Distributor road, likely to include vehicles slowing down and waiting on the road, in the vicinity of the school is likely to be detrimental to highway safety.

Although the number of dwellings does not meet the minimum requirements for a full Transport Assessment, I require that the applicant provide a detailed transport statement addressing Policy T19. The applicant has not demonstrated that the adjacent highway network can safely accommodate the increase in traffic. I would therefore, as submitted, not support this application on the grounds that it would be contrary to Policy T19 of the Kent Structure Plan.

- 4.5 KCC Education & Libraries: The extra demand for primary and secondary school places can be accommodated within local schools. However, the additional cost in providing Library facilities is £149.50 per dwelling and Youth and Community facilities £498.00 per dwelling. An appropriate condition should be attached to require these contributions.
- 4.6 Network Rail: No objections but would like applicant's attention to be drawn to Network Rail requirements.
- 4.7 London Green Belt Council: On a Green Belt site, such proposed development is 'inappropriate', and in relation to any 'very special circumstances' which the applicant may advance, these may have parallels, though the end product may be more permanent, as a loss of Green Belt to travellers pleading a lack of alternative sites.

Nevertheless, the guidelines of PPG2 make Green Belt quite different from 'greenfield' at large and, in this case, paragraph 1.7 may be relevant to the Council's consideration.

The matter of precedents, both in the immediate area and more widely, is very important and can not be avoided and it is hoped therefore that this application be refuse in order that Green Belt policies be upheld, both in respect of the Council's own Plan and generally.

- 4.8 Private Reps: 45 +Art 8 site & press notices. 71S/68R/2X. In addition to the individual letters received, a petition containing 89 names has been received in support of the application and a petition containing 266 names objecting to the proposals. Supporters of the scheme have raised questions with the veracity of the petition lodged in objection to this application and opponents to the scheme have similarly questioned the veracity of the petition in support.

Support for the affordable housing has been offered on the following grounds:

- It will provide much needed 'low cost' housing within St Mary's Platt, which currently suffers from a shortage of such properties, making it hard for people on low incomes to live in the village. A mixture of housing types and tenure would be beneficial for the village to enable a wide range of people to live there.
- It will provide crucial funding to realise the new Platt school proposals which are intended to be largely self-funding. The affordable housing is a key part of a community led project to provide a new school, a new Memorial Hall and social housing.
- The development can only take place on MGB land because of the tightly drawn village confines.



- Although countryside/MGB land, the site is sandwiched between the A25, a main railway line and housing.

Objections to the affordable housing have been made on the following grounds:

- The LEA should fund the school rather than it being funded through the development of the village.
- Sufficient affordable housing for the Borough is likely will be provided at sites such as Kings Hill and Leybourne Grange so the need for these further properties is questioned. In any event, it is argued that the number being proposed is excessive for the needs of the village.
- The proposed dwellings would be sited on an undeveloped field that is designated as ALLI and MGB and which provides a view of the KDAONB beyond. The proposal would have an urbanising impact through the loss of this green space and views of the AONB will be obstructed by the development.
- Highway hazards arising from new access.
- Damage to wildlife such as slow worms and newts would result from developing a green field site.

**5. Determining Issues:**

- 5.1 Members will recall that proposals for affordable housing were included within planning application TM/03/03647/OA, which was a multi-faceted application that sought consent for a new school, a new memorial hall and various housing developments. Members will also recall that application was refused by this Council and has subsequently become the subject of a planning appeal that is scheduled to be heard in December this year. The grounds of refusal cited for that application were as follows:

***“The Borough Council does not consider that the case of Very Special Circumstances advanced, in seeking to justify the provision of Affordable Housing on Site 1, is sufficient to set aside the strong policy objection to new development in the Metropolitan Green Belt, the undeveloped countryside or within an Area of Local Landscape Interest. As a result, the proposal is contrary, inter alia, to PPG2: Green Belts; policies MGB3 and RS5 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996 and policies P2/16 and P3/7 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998.”***

- 5.2 The reason for refusal on that application related solely to the proposed housing element of TM/03/02647/OA; that whole site fell in the Green Belt. The current application proposes an alternative location for the proposed affordable housing.

While this planning history be borne in mind, it is also crucial that the current case be assessed on its own merits – especially in terms of the site itself and any material change in planning policy or other factors since the earlier decision was issued.

- 5.3 This site lies outside the built confines of Platt and, while it is located between the A25 and the Ashford to Victoria railway line it has dwellings either side. It is in open countryside falling within the MGB. Subsequently, PPG2 – Green Belts and policies MGB3 of the KSP 1996, SS9 and HP6 of the KMSP 2003 and TMBLP policy P2/16 are all relevant to these proposals in respect of the Green Belt setting. PPS 7 is also relevant and several Development Plan policies such as ENV1, RS1 and RS5 of the KSP 1996, E1 of the KMSP 2003 apply to the proposals submitted in terms of the setting in open countryside.
- 5.4 Under the terms of Green Belt policies, the proposed development of this site for residential purposes is ‘*inappropriate*’ development within the Green Belt as set out by PPG2. (Recent government advice indicates that a more relaxed approach may be taken with affordable housing on rural sites where there is a proven need and by subsequent land allocation in a Local Plan/LDF rather than overriding the provisions of PPG2 which clearly defines proposals such as this within the Green Belt as ‘*inappropriate*’). Whilst policies exist within the Development Plan that lend favour to the provision of affordable housing outside of settlements in certain circumstances, there is no planning policy that identifies that affordable housing is an appropriate form of development within the MGB. The 1992 version of PPG3 accepts that affordable housing may be acceptable **within** the confines of settlements "washed over" by the Green Belt but such considerations do not apply here.
- 5.5 Accordingly, in order to establish whether or not this proposal can be supported in principle it is necessary to establish whether there are ‘very special circumstances’ of sufficient weight to set aside the Green Belt objections.
- 5.6 The applicant has advanced a case that is essentially based upon local need for affordable housing. This need is justified by a Housing Needs Survey that has been carried out on behalf of the applicant. This work comprises two parts, the study originally carried out to support planning application TM/03/03647/OA and an update dealing with the changes in circumstances since the last study was carried out to provide details of the current situation. The veracity of the study has been strongly questioned by some residents and has been examined carefully by the DHH. As can be seen from the consultations section of this report, DHH has expressed the view that whilst there are some aspects of the survey that give rise to some uncertainty about the extent of housing need, it does indicate that a degree of local need exists. This, coupled with information from the housing register, demonstrate that there is a local need for some affordable housing as established in connection with the previous application – although the precise extent of the need in Platt is extremely difficult to identify.

- 5.7 Notwithstanding local need for affordable housing, I am not satisfied that the balance of current circumstances are such to warrant setting aside the normal Green Belt policy objections to residential development in this location. I am of the opinion that it has not yet been proven that there is not the potential for affordable housing to be accommodated on an alternative site (or a combination of sites) within the built confines.
- 5.8 The applicant has claimed that there are not realistically any alternative sites that will come forward. However, the future of the Platt School site, the Brickmakers' Arms site, the School Playing Fields site and the Memorial Hall site have not yet been defined or determined. Furthermore, looking to the future, the emerging LDF has earmarked a site at Isles Quarry West, Borough Green, as a preferred approach to addressing affordable housing needs in the rural parts of the Borough. Whilst this has yet to be fully tested through public consultation, it does offer a possible future solution to addressing housing need by development of a site that is damaged land and already developed in part. This factor alone is a material change in circumstances as development on Isles Quarry would be policy compliant (assuming that the Council's new policy is adopted) whereas use of the current site would not be. This is what should be expected in a plan led system.
- 5.9 It is necessary for the applicant to demonstrate that no site, or sites, are available to accommodate the affordable housing before it is proven that there are VSCs to justify building these dwellings in the Green Belt. In my view, this has not been done and there is little prospect of being able to demonstrate this at this time or indeed the foreseeable future. In such circumstances, the release of this site for housing development, albeit affordable, is not justified and would be contrary to well established Green Belt policy.
- 5.10 Although the application site is not the most 'open' area of land within this part of the Green Belt, this is not a reason for its release. Planning Policy dictates that Green Belt and open countryside are to be safeguarded for their own sakes and it is not a reasonable justification to suggest that Green Belt can be developed simply because it does not form part of a wider swathe of open countryside and Green Belt. Indeed, PPG2 does not imply a "scale" of quality nor suggest that some parts of the Green Belt can be considered to be less important than others. Furthermore, the local Green Belt value of this site lies in its function in maintaining an undeveloped, rural setting to this approach into St Mary's Platt.
- 5.11 I do not consider that the case of need advanced justifies the development in relation to other policies aimed at the protection of the wider countryside.
- 5.12 The applicant has also made reference to the fact there would be some financial proceeds from the sale of this land to fund the recently approved new Platt School. However, I do not consider that this financial consideration constitutes a VSC of

any great weight. In addition, it should be noted that KCC's Education Directorate has indicated that this development does not generate a need for financial contributions to be made to primary school places in this instance.

- 5.13 A development of the scale proposed would clearly alter the undeveloped nature of the site, particularly since it involves two storey development, in a visually prominent location. For instance, it would be necessary for an acoustic barrier to be provided along the site's frontage (albeit with some frontage screening and vegetation retained and augmented). Consequently, the proposals will harm the character and appearance of the local countryside and in the absence of overriding policy justification, this impact must also weigh against the proposal.
- 5.14 Turning now to highway issues, KCC (Highways) have expressed concern about the creation of a new access onto the A25 in proximity to the existing Platt School site. I fully understand this concern and concur that it would be an unacceptable situation for a new access serving 20 dwellings to be in operation in such close proximity to the busy Platt School accesses and Pine View bearing in mind local traffic levels and the character of the A25 itself. In such circumstances, there would appear to be a conflict between these proposals and Policy T19 of the KSP 1996. Consequently, whilst the internal layout of the proposed scheme and the level of parking proposed are satisfactory in highway safety terms, the proposals can not be supported in terms of traffic generation. (KCC has indicated that this objection may be less pressing if construction and occupation of the new houses post dated the closure of Platt School on its existing site. I am looking at whether or not there is an appropriate mechanism that could secure such a deferment in construction/occupation and will report on this matter further in a supplementary report).
- 5.15 Turning to noise and environmental health issues, DHH reports that the acoustic appraisal that has been submitted appears to be reasonable in its evaluation and conclusions. Whilst some of the site falls within NEC 'C', the measures identified within the report appear to make the site capable of accepting residential development. Moreover, while some aspects of the proposed development do not strictly accord with the recommendations of the acoustic assessment, I am satisfied that the proposals would be acceptable in terms of their received noise climate if the full recommendations of the report were implemented and this could be achieved through the attachment of creation conditions.
- 5.16 With regard to land contamination, a site and soil survey has been submitted and, again, with the attachment of an appropriate condition as recommended by DHH, I am confident that the site could be capable of being developed without any undue contamination problems.

- 5.17 The proposed housing layout originally posed problems to the outlook and privacy of some adjacent property but has been amended by the applicant following my identification of those problems. Accordingly, I now find the scheme to be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring dwellings.
- 5.18 The proposals will necessitate the removal of several trees from the site but again, the applicant has amended the internal layout of the scheme to ensure that the most important trees can be retained. In the light of this fact, there could be no sustainable objection to this development on the grounds of loss of trees – subject to conditions safeguarding the retained trees during construction and requiring a landscaping scheme with some compensatory planting.
- 5.19 In respect of this proposal's potential harm to wildlife, given that both the DL and KWT have raised no objection in the light of the submitted wildlife report and its conclusions, I am satisfied that this development would not cause any significant detriment to any wildlife of high ecology value.
- 5.20 In conclusion, whilst I acknowledge on the basis of the submitted housing survey and other information such as the housing register that there is a local need for affordable housing at Platt, I can not support the use of this rural Green Belt site to meet that need given the highway objections and that a sufficient case of VSC does not exist to warrant setting aside fundamental national and Development Plan Policy.

## **6. Recommendation:**

### **6.1 Refuse Planning Permission** for the following reasons:

- 1 The Borough Council does not consider that the case of Very Special Circumstances advanced, in seeking to justify the provision of Affordable Housing on this site, is sufficient to set aside the strong policy objection to new residential development in the Metropolitan Green Belt and the undeveloped countryside. As a result, the proposal is contrary, inter alia, to PPG2: Green Belts; policies ENV1, MGB3 and RS5 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996, E1, SS9 and HP6 of the KMSP 2003 and policy P2/16 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan 1998.
- 2 The proposal would be likely to interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic onto an important classified road by virtue of an unacceptable increase in traffic movements onto and off the A25 in close proximity to existing accesses serving Platt School and Pine View. Accordingly, the proposals are found to be contrary to Policy T19 of the Kent Structure Plan 1996 and Policy TP11 of the emerging Kent & Medway Structure Plan 2003.

Contact: Kevin Wise