

## Schedule 2 - Summary Schedule of Proposed Changes

(Resulting from Representations and referred to in Position and Rebuttal Statements and accepted at the Public Hearing)

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Para 2.2.1 – Revise third sentence to read:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Structure Plan was adopted in <del>June</del> <u>July</u> 2006.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 175.04</p>
<p>Para 2.2.5 - Revise the fifth sentence to read:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Tonbridge is identified together with Tunbridge Wells as a <del>Transport Hub of regional significance</del> <u>Regional Hub</u>.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 158.01</p>
<p>Para 2.3.4 – Revise to read:</p> <p>2.3.4 The agenda for change to meet local needs for development and services has therefore to be carefully formulated within this highly constrained policy framework. <del>Consequently, the key objective is to focus sustainable development within settlements and on damaged land.</del></p>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 181.16</p>
<p>Revise the Section on <b><i>Housing Land Supply</i></b> to read:</p> <p>2.5.3 <b>Annex C</b> is a Housing Trajectory, prepared in accordance with Government advice, which compares the committed supply of housing, with the housing requirements for Tonbridge and Malling 2006-2021 as set out in the submitted</p>	<p>See Annex A to Position Statement CS01 To take account of PPS3</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>version of the RSS. Committed supply comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4606 dwellings on sites already with planning permission as at 31 March 2006 likely to be implemented during this period;</li> <li>• Unimplemented housing allocations in the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Local Plan likely to be implemented before 2021 totalling 1065 dwellings. In this respect, it should be noted that 1000 of these dwellings are at Peters Pit which has been granted planning permission since the base date of 31 March 2006. <u>The other 65 are on the remaining part of Kings Hill that does not yet have planning permission.</u></li> </ul> <p>The total firm supply therefore equals 5671 dwellings, which is 704 below the submitted RSS requirement of 6375 dwellings for the 2006-2021 period. However, on the basis of past performance windfall development is likely to contribute at least an additional 2330 dwellings during this period which will mean that the overall requirement will be exceeded. In line with <del>draft</del> PPS3, there is more than sufficient land allocated to meet the requirements for the first <del>510</del> years following the anticipated adoption of the LDF (ie up to <del>2013</del> <u>2018</u>) without relying on windfalls.</p> <p>2.5.4 <del>There is therefore already sufficient land potentially available to meet anticipated housing requirements up to 2021</del> <u>Disregarding windfalls up to 2018 there will, on the basis of the submitted RSS, be an overall shortfall of just 194 dwellings up to 2021.</u> Assuming the approved RSS requirements <del>up to 2021</del> are not dissimilar, this means that the only justification for the release of greenfield sites for housing through the LDF would be <del>to meet local needs that could not be met in any other way</del> <u>if it proves impossible to identify sites for 194 dwellings on previously developed land.</u> This is fundamental to the Core Strategy.</p>	

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Revise the Section on the <i>Urban Capacity Study and Windfall Projection</i> to read:</p> <p>2.5.5 An Urban Capacity Study has been completed in accordance with the advice in <del>PPG3 and its companion document entitled</del> <b>Tapping the Potential</b>. For consistency of approach it has been prepared in broad accordance with a protocol agreed with other authorities in Kent. Most of the sites identified through the Study will be brought forward as housing allocations in the Development Allocations DPD.</p> <p>2.5.6 <del>Draft PPS3 makes it clear if an allowance is to be made for a continuing yield from</del> <b>windfall development</b> <del>it should be based upon a thorough examination of past trends.</del> <b>Windfall development</b> is development that takes place on sites which have not specifically been identified as being available through the Development Plan process. <u>PPS3 makes it clear that an allowance for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of local circumstances that prevent sites being identified.</u></p> <p>2.5.7 The yield from small windfall sites (below 5 dwellings) is projected to be some 70 dwellings per year. The overall projected yield from larger sites (5 dwellings or more) is projected to be 1280 dwellings (2006-2021). This excludes existing permissions for windfall development and potential allocations to avoid double counting. These estimates will be subject to regular monitoring. <u>In the Housing Trajectory (Annex C) windfalls are only counted beyond 10 years from the anticipated date of adoption of the Core Strategy.</u></p>	<p>See Annex A to Position Statement CS01 To take account of PPS3</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Para 2.5.15 – Revise the final sentence to read:</p> <p>However, if there are no suitable sites in Maidstone <u>the identified retail need could be accommodated at Quarry Wood</u> <del>the headroom is such that an extension to the Quarry Wood Retail Park could be justified.</del></p>	<p>In response to comments made by Ringbest and discussed at the Public Hearing.</p>
<p><b>Aims</b></p> <p>Aim 1(d) – Revise to read:</p> <p>(d) Minimising the need to travel and providing the opportunity for trips to be made by <del>all</del> <u>a choice of</u> modes of transport;</p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 182.02</p>
<p>Aim 2 (c) - Revise to read:</p> <p>(c) Avoiding <u>the adverse effects of development</u> in areas of significance for landscape or nature conservation, areas at risk of flooding, important historic assets and the best and most versatile agricultural land;</p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 91.05</p>
<p>Aim 2(e) - Revise to read:</p> <p>(d) Ensuring infrastructure and services are co-ordinated to meet the needs of existing and any new communities, wherever required <del>as an integral part of the</del> <u>in association with</u> new development;</p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 175.05</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p><b>The Strategy</b></p> <p>Para 5.1.4 - Revise second sentence to read:</p> <p><del>Unless there are special circumstances,</del> New development will be located within the built-up areas of these settlements mainly on previously developed land or by conversion of existing buildings.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 181.17</p>
<p>Policy CP1.2 – Revise to read:</p> <p><b>2. Provision will be made for housing, employment and <u>retail other</u> development to meet the needs of existing and future residents of the Borough in line with the evolving housing requirements of the South East Plan and local studies aimed at informing the need for, and form of, development required.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 301.07</p>
<p>Policy CP1.4 – Revise to read:</p> <p><b>4. In selecting locations for development and determining planning applications the Borough Council will seek to minimise waste generation, reduce the need to travel and minimise water and energy consumption, having regard to <del>sources of renewable energy</del> <u>the need for 10% of energy requirements to be generated on-site from alternative energy sources</u> and the potential for <u>the recycling of</u> water. Where possible, areas liable to flood will be avoided.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS10 In the light of Rep 158.02</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Policy CP1.6 – Revise to read:</p> <p><b>6. Development will be concentrated at the highest density compatible with the local built and natural environment mainly on previously developed land and at those urban and rural settlements where a reasonable range of services is available and where there is the potential to be well served by sustainable modes of transport. <u>Best use will be made of the existing housing stock.</u></b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 158.09</p>
<p>Policy CP1.7 – Revise to read</p> <p><b>7. Development must minimise the risk of crime and should make appropriate provision for <u>the infrastructure necessary to serve new development, including social leisure, cultural and community facilities and adequate open space accessible to all.</u> If still needed, existing facilities will be protected and land required to meet future community needs will be identified and safeguarded for that purpose.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 175.06</p>
<p>Para 6.1.5 - Revise the third bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and wildlife and avoiding impact on <del>statutorily protected sites</del> <u>areas of nature conservation interest;</u></li> </ul>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 175.07</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Para 6.1.5 – Revise the eighth bullet point to read;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>meeting aiming to meet</del> BREEAM or Eco-Homes very good standard <del>as a minimum</del> for all development;</li> </ul> <p>Note: In the light of the latest Government Guidance this should now be updated to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• aiming to meet Code Level 3 of the Government’s Code for Sustainable Homes fro all new-build dwellings</li> </ul>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 221.01</p> <p>This standard effectively replaces the BREEAM and Eco-Homes Standard.</p>
<p>Policy CP2 (e) – Correct to read:</p> <p><b>(e) provide for any necessary enhancements to the safety of the highway network and capacity of transport infrastructure whilst avoiding road improvements that significantly harm the natural <u>of</u> or historic environment or the character of the area.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 175.08</p>
<p>Para 6.2.3 – Revise the second sentence to read:</p> <p>The <del>extent</del> <u>boundaries</u> of the Green Belt has <u>have</u> been set in previous local plans.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 181.19</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Policy CP5 – Revise to read:</p> <p><b>Unless justified by special circumstances, development will not be proposed in the LDF or otherwise permitted that would harm the function of the <u>mid Kent Strategic gap</u> as a physical break maintaining the separation and separate identities of the built-up areas of Maidstone, Medway Towns and the Medway Gap.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS06 In response to Reps 175.09/10</p>
<p>Para 6.2.23 – Revise the second sentence to read:</p> <p>Sites of national significance are designated by <del>English Nature</del> <u>Natural England</u> as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).</p>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 64.04</p>
<p>Para 6.3.11 – Revise to read</p> <p>6.3.11 There is significant scope for additional development and re-development within existing settlements as identified in the Council’s Urban Capacity Study. In addition, there are four large ‘brownfield’ sites adjoining or close to the Medway Gap Urban Area (at Holborough, Kings Hill, Leybourne Grange and Peter’s Pit). Together with projected windfalls <u>in the 10-15 year period</u>, these sites <del>can comfortably accommodate</del> <u>get very close to accommodating</u> the levels of development set out in the South East Plan without the need for release of any greenfield land (see <b>Annex C</b>). <u>On the basis of allocating land for an additional 194 dwellings within the built-up areas, there will be</u> <del>There is therefore</del> no need to identify any greenfield sites for housing development. In consequence, the</p>	<p>Annex A to Position Statement CS01 To take account of PPS3</p>



Proposed Change	Reason
<p>only housing development that can be justified in the countryside is that necessary to meet locally identified needs, and/or rural diversification. If the figures in the South East Plan as ultimately approved are significantly higher then attention will turn first to the Area of Opportunity at Bushey Wood but it is likely that even in that event it would not be required until towards the end of the LDF timeframe.</p>	
<p>Para 6.3.14 – Revise to read:</p> <p>6.3.14 The general location of the Strategic Sites is shown on the Key Diagram. Their precise extent will be shown <u>for information</u> on the Proposals Map.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS11 In the light of Rep 172.03</p>
<p>Policy CP17 – Revise to read:</p> <p><b>Land at Bushey Wood is identified as an Area of Opportunity containing land with potential for meeting needs in the post 2021 period, or earlier if there is any significant shortfall in strategic housing provision. <u>Land will only be released for housing development within the Area of Opportunity though the preparation of an Area Action Plan.</u> In the meantime, development will not be proposed in the LDF or otherwise permitted which might prejudice its long- term potential.</b></p>	<p>Supplementary Statement CS02E/2 In the light of Rep 172.05 and discussion at the Hearing.</p> <p>Note: this change supersedes that in para 7.1 of Position Statement CS02.</p>
<p>Para 6.3.21 – Replace the first sentence after the Policy with the following:</p> <p>The situation will be reviewed through annual monitoring, but in order to ensure confidence about housing delivery in the long term, the Area Action Plan would</p>	<p>Supplementary Statement CS02E/2 In the light of discussion at the Hearing</p> <p>Note: this change supersedes that in para 7.1 of</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>need to be in place before the approval of the first review of the South East Plan. The Area Action Plan will indicate the circumstances under which land will be released and the sequence and phasing of development.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS02 and in Supplementary Statement CS02E.</p>
<p>Para 6.3.22 - Revise the tenth bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of adequate access to the area <u>from the principal road network and the M20 motorway</u> avoiding the village of Eccles</li> </ul>	<p>Rebuttal Statement CS02 (para 6.4) In response to comments from the Highways Agency</p>
<p>Para 6.3.22 – Revise the twelfth bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship between any development and the Aylesford Wastewater Treatment Works <u>including any need to extend the works</u></li> </ul>	<p>Rebuttal Statement CS02 (para 4.3) In response to comments from Southern Water</p>
<p>Para 6.3.22 - Add the following bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship between any development and the employment uses on the west bank of the river.</li> </ul>	<p>Position Statement CS02 In response to Rep 253.01</p>
<p>Para 6.3.24 - Revise the end of the paragraph to read:</p> <p>Housing for key for essential workers can fall into any one of the above categories, depending on the disposable income of the household. <u>Affordable housing should remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or, if this restriction is lifted, the subsidy should be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision</u></p>	<p>Position Statement CS05 In response to Rep 158.07</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Para 6.3.30 – Revise to read:</p> <p>6.3.30 Affordable housing provision and the proportion of social rented housing will be monitored and kept under regular review and <u>if justified</u> the level to be sought on development sites will be revised <u>downwards as necessary</u> through the production of a Supplementary Planning Document. Further advice on the provision of affordable housing is contained in an Affordable Housing Guidance Note (to be updated to reflect the new policy context).</p>	<p>Rebuttal Statement CS05 (para 2.7) In response to comments from the Home Builders' Federation</p>
<p>Policy E1 – revise part 2 of the Policy to read:</p> <p><b>2. Employment areas that:</b></p> <p>(a) <b>are well located to the main road and public transport network, <u>and</u>;</b></p> <p>(b) <b><u>provide, or are physically and viably capable of providing through redevelopment, good quality modern accommodation attractive to the market, and:</u></b></p> <p>(c) <b>are capable of meeting a range of employment uses <u>to support the local economy</u>;</b></p> <p><b>will be safeguarded for such purposes. Redevelopment of such sites for housing, retail or other non-employment uses will not be proposed in the LDF or otherwise permitted.</b></p>	<p>Rebuttal Statement CS08 (para3.5)</p> <p>Rebuttal Statement CS08 and in response to discussion at the Hearing.</p>
<p>Para 6.3.46 – Revise the first part of the paragraph to read:</p>	<p>Position Statement CS09 and discussion at the</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>6.3.46 In the north of the Borough, the main focus for retail development is the South Aylesford Retail Park at Quarry Wood. <del>This Retail Park Quarry Wood</del> contains a mixture of retail outlets for convenience and comparison goods and is considered to be the most suitable location for <del>expansion</del> <u>additional comparison goods retail development</u> if there is an identified need for comparison goods shopping that cannot be met within the Maidstone urban area.....</p>	<p>Public Hearing. n the light of Rep 180.09</p>
<p>Para 6.3.50 – Revise to read:</p> <p>6.3.50 The South East Plan identifies Tonbridge as a regionally important town centre and, together with Tunbridge Wells, as a <del>Transport Hub of regional significance</del> <u>Regional Hub</u> where investment in improving accessibility and economic development is to be promoted.</p>	<p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 158.01</p>
<p>Policy CP24 (f) – Revise to read:</p> <p><b>(f) generally enhancing the public realm, including protecting and enhancing important open spaces and the creation of new ones, reducing the potential for anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime and making design statements at the gateways to the town centre.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 91.11</p>
<p>Para 6.4.9 – Add the following words at the end of the paragraph:</p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 175.20</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>..... These will have to be determined on a case by case basis. <u>Where a developer considers that the full funding or provision of all necessary infrastructure and facilities is not possible, the Council will require the applicant to provide validated open book accounts, on a confidential basis, to substantiate their case.</u> The following policy provides the context for all development.</p>	
<p>Policy CP26.1 – Revise the second sentence to read [175.20]:</p> <p><b>All development proposals must therefore either incorporate the infrastructure required as a result of the scheme, or make provision for financial contributions <u>and/or land</u> to secure such infrastructure or service provision at the time it is needed, by means of conditions or a planning obligation.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 175.20</p>
<p>Para 6.4.12 – Revise to read:</p> <p>6.4.12 For communities to be sustainable it is essential for a range of community services to be available. Community Services include schools and other education provision, social services, adult education, libraries, <u>community and youth services, health, culture, places of worship, police and emergency services, recreation and amenity space, sport, local shopping, public utilities and transport.</u> The Development Land Allocations DPD will identify specific proposals based upon detailed advice from service providers. The LDF will therefore inform the investment programmes of community infrastructure providers. <u>For a full definition of infrastructure see Figure 2 in the South East Plan Implementation Plan.</u></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Reps 223.01/02, 292.01, 303.01</p> <p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Reps 158.10, 60.01, 303.02</p>

Proposed Change	Reason
<p>Policy 27.3(c) Revise section 3(c) to read:</p> <p><b>(c) the applicant has proved to the satisfaction of the Council that for the foreseeable future there <u>is</u> likely to be an absence of need or <u>adequate</u> support for the facility.</b></p>	<p>Position Statement CS12. In response to Rep 175.21 and 310.01</p>
<p><b>Annex B</b> – make the following amendments to the documents listed in Annex B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Transport Plan for Kent (<del>2005</del>) <u>2006-2011 (2006)</u></li> <li>• Kent Biodiversity Action Plan (<del>1997</del>) <u>(2005)</u></li> <li>• Kent Community Strategy – <i>Vision for Kent</i> (<del>March 2002</del>) <u>(April 2006)</u></li> <li>• Kent Minerals Local Plan : <u>Brickearth (1986); Construction Aggregates(1993); Chalk &amp; Clay/Oil &amp; Gas (1997)</u></li> </ul>	<p>Position Statement CS11. In response to Rep 78.03</p> <p>Position Statement CS13. In response to Rep 175.23</p>
<p><b>Key Diagram</b> – Improve contrast between colours used for the Green Belt and the Strategic Gap</p>	<p>Position Statement CS11 para 2(3) In response to Rep 171.11</p>
<p><b>Key Diagram</b> – add a symbol to identify Quarry Wood as the “Preferred location for comparison retail development” pursuant to Policy CP23.1(c)</p>	<p>Rebuttal Statement CS09 para 2.1. In response to representations from AXA.</p>
<p><b>Proposals Map</b> – Delete land from the Special Landscape Area as identified under Annex A to Position Statement CS07</p>	<p>Position Statement CS07 – Annex A</p>