

ALAN BISHOP

ITEM 9



ASHFORD
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Biddenden Community Workshop

Notes of the Biddenden Community Workshop held on the 12th February 2009

Present:

15 attendees

Also Present:

Planning Policy Manager, Simon Cole, Senior Planner, Daniel Carter; DC Planning Manager, Martin Vink.

Independent Workshop Facilitator, Keith Nicholson

The Workshop began with an introduction from Keith Nicholson which :

- outlined the key steps the Planning Department had undertaken to date with regard to the preparation of the Tenterden and Rural sites Development Plan Document
- explained the format of the workshop exercise
- the wider Policy Context of CS6. (see pages 31-39 ABC Adopted Core Strategy)

Simon Cole updated the delegates about the Tenterden and Rural Sites Development Plan Document (DPD) process, and stressed the importance of consistency with the Core Strategy. It was also explained that DPD would run up until 2021, but may adopt a phased approach to the release of development sites, to run in line with the first phase of the Core Strategy (2006-2014), and then review the position in line with the Core Strategy review.

Simon Cole and Daniel Carter then broke out into groups to discuss the planning merits of each site on the map.

- BID 06, 24, 6a, & 15 were not favoured. It was considered that development here wouldn't be well related to the village and would result in an isolated development, too far away from the services.
- BID18 and BID04 were not considered appropriate. The officers considered that the majority of BID18 represented open countryside with far reaching and attractive, long range views. The area of BID 18 nearest the road, and site BID04 were felt to mark an attractive entrance into the village. Most of this area was marked by attractive trees and hedgerows and any development here would adversely impact on this setting. Access was also considered an issue, particularly in relation to the bend in the road and possible sight lines.
- BID19b, 19a & 20 were not considered appropriate. This combined area is clearly visible from the east and as such any development here would have a visual impact. In addition, it is unclear how development here would be well

related to the existing built form of the area to the west of these sites. This area was also considered to mark a key entrance into the village which at present has a well defined gateway, with development both sides of the road when entering the village.

- BID 21 was not considered to be an appropriate extension to the village. The use on the site is currently active and it is unclear how housing development would be well related to the existing built form in this area.
- BID10, BID09, BID 01 & 11a. This area was not considered suitable for development. These sites enjoy wide ranging views over the countryside and would be clearly visible from the hinterland. In addition, it is hard to see how development here could be successfully integrated with the existing built form in this area, and could result in substantial back-land development, adversely affecting the residential amenity here.
- BID 07 enjoys long ranging views over the countryside and lies in a prominent position on the landscape. Development here would extend the village into the countryside and wouldn't be in keeping with the overall, fairly compact, nature of the villages urban form. There would also be issues of back land development and the residential amenity of the exiting residents all along the southern boundary of the site. Overall development is not considered appropriate here.
- BID23 was considered too small to accommodate 5 housing units or more. It is also in active employment use. It was therefore considered to be a development control issue rather than a Development Plan one.
- BID03, BID17, was not favoured. It is hard to see how an access could be achieved in this location. Development in this location could also raise back-land development issues and affect the residential amenity of the exiting occupiers in this area.
- BID11b was considered to have some planning merit. The officers believed it to represent a site which is well related to the urban form of the surrounding area and development would fit in well with its surroundings. Development should not encroach further north than the existing developments to avoid unnecessary encroachment into the countryside and continue the well defined village boundary here. Access may be an issue as it would require movement through existing cul-de-sacs to get onto the road network.
- BID 16 was considered to have some planning merit. Development here would fit in the surrounding nature of the built form and wouldn't be visually intrusive. Access was potentially an issue, both in relation to accessing the main road network through a cul-de-sac, but also in achieving a suitable width of road to access the site, as there appears to be limited space. The potential impact of the sewage works, located to the west, is also a factor that needs investigating in relation to the suitability of houses here.
- BID 12, was considered to have some planning merit. It would represent an acceptable extension to the existing built form. This area also sits in a dip in the landscape which would ensure development here would have limited visual impact from the surrounding area. The site is also closely related to the services within the village.
- The frontage of BID 22 was considered to have some planning merit. Development here could continue the linear development present to the south and emulate the linear development to the north of the road.

Workshop Exercise

BID11b

Both groups agreed with the offices comments in relation to this site. One group strongly favoured this site and felt it represented an appropriate infill plot and would have limited visual impact. Access was raised as a concern but the participants felt that this was no more an issue here, than elsewhere in the village. Both groups favoured the aspiration to retain the clearly defined boundary edge of the settlement, and therefore requested development to the rear of the site should be level with the exiting built form.

BID16

The groups agreed that this site had some merit. They felt it represented an appropriate infill plot and would be well related to the village, with little visual impact. One group felt that development may be able to offer an attractive front to the square. The participants accepted access may be an issue, however one group wanted the Council to explored if access could be achieved from the existing housing estate to the east.

BID22

The general consensus from both groups felt that the frontage may have some planning merit. A minority of people didn't favour this site however, as they felt it marked a pleasant gap in the village with attractive views over the countryside. One participant felt that land ownership would be an issue, in any event, as they were marketed recently in individual plots.

BID 12

Both groups agreed with the officers comments in relation to the planning merits of this site. One group favoured this site as it represented the closest to the village centre and associated services. However, concerns were raised about traffic congestion being raised due to development. This area is already heavily congested by residents of nearby neighbourhoods parking their cars on the street. One group wanted a requirement for the development to deliver more parking in the area.

BID23

Both groups felt that this site would make a better residential site than what is currently on site. One group urged the Council to actively re-locate this business to another location. The officer explained the context of rural employment to the participants. It was generally accepted that this site would be too small to accommodate 5 units so it is more likely to be a development control issue, than a Plan one.

BID03 BID 17 ('BID26')

Both groups felt that BID03 and BID17 had some merit and shouldn't be ruled out at this stage. They also grouped the area of BID07 to the east of this area in same context. (one group defined this area as BID26 on the map). The groups felt that this area could

be a location where a cul-de-sac type development could be located. The felt the access could be achieved and appropriate sight lines would be possible from this side of the road. One group referred back to the Parish Plan which stipulated a desire to see cul-de-sac development coming forward in Biddenden.

The evening was concluded by Simon Cole, who outlined the Key next steps in the process of producing the Tenterden and Rural Development Plan Document. For further information regarding the timetable, please see the ABC Local Development Scheme (LDS)

ALAN BISHOP
ITEM 9



ASHFORD
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Biddenden Community Workshop

Notes of the Biddenden Community Workshop held on the 12th February 2009

Present:

15 attendees

Also Present:

Planning Policy Manager, Simon Cole, Senior Planner, Daniel Carter; DC Planning Manager, Martin Vink.

Independent Workshop Facilitator, Keith Nicholson

The Workshop began with an introduction from Keith Nicholson which :

- outlined the key steps the Planning Department had undertaken to date with regard to the preparation of the Tenterden and Rural sites Development Plan Document
 - explained the format of the workshop exercise
 - the wider Policy Context of CS6. (see pages 31-39 ABC Adopted Core Strategy)
-

Simon Cole updated the delegates about the Tenterden and Rural Sites Development Plan Document (DPD) process, and stressed the importance of consistency with the Core Strategy. It was also explained that DPD would run up until 2021, but may adopt a phased approach to the release of development sites, to run in line with the first phase of the Core Strategy (2006-2014), and then review the position in line with the Core Strategy review.

Simon Cole and Daniel Carter then broke out into groups to discuss the planning merits of each site on the map.

- BID 06, 24, 6a, & 15 were not favoured. It was considered that development here wouldn't be well related to the village and would result in an isolated development, too far away from the services.
- BID18 and BID04 were not considered appropriate. The officers considered that the majority of BID18 represented open countryside with far reaching and attractive, long range views. The area of BID 18 nearest the road, and site BID04 were felt to mark an attractive entrance into the village. Most of this area was marked by attractive trees and hedgerows and any development here would adversely impact on this setting. Access was also considered an issue, particularly in relation to the bend in the road and possible sight lines.
- BID19b, 19a & 20 were not considered appropriate. This combined area is clearly visible from the east and as such any development here would have a visual impact. In addition, it is unclear how development here would be well

related to the existing built form of the area to the west of these sites. This area was also considered to mark a key entrance into the village which at present has a well defined gateway, with development both sides of the road when entering the village.

- BID 21 was not considered to be an appropriate extension to the village. The use on the site is currently active and it is unclear how housing development would be well related to the existing built form in this area.
- BID10, BID09, BID 01 & 11a. This area was not considered suitable for development. These sites enjoy wide ranging views over the countryside and would be clearly visible from the hinterland. In addition, it is hard to see how development here could be successfully integrated with the existing built form in this area, and could result in substantial back-land development, adversely affecting the residential amenity here.
- BID 07 enjoys long ranging views over the countryside and lies in a prominent position on the landscape. Development here would extend the village into the countryside and wouldn't be in keeping with the overall, fairly compact, nature of the villages urban form. There would also be issues of back land development and the residential amenity of the exiting residents all along the southern boundary of the site. Overall development is not considered appropriate here.
- BID23 was considered too small to accommodate 5 housing units or more. It is also in active employment use. It was therefore considered to be a development control issue rather than a Development Plan one.
- BID03, BID17, was not favoured. It is hard to see how an access could be achieved in this location. Development in this location could also raise back-land development issues and affect the residential amenity of the exiting occupiers in this area.
- BID11b was considered to have some planning merit. The officers believed it to represent a site which is well related to the urban form of the surrounding area and development would fit in well with its surroundings. Development should not encroach further north than the existing developments to avoid unnecessary encroachment into the countryside and continue the well defined village boundary here. Access may be an issue as it would require movement through existing cul-de-sacs to get onto the road network.
- BID 16 was considered to have some planning merit. Development here would fit in the surrounding nature of the built form and wouldn't be visually intrusive. Access was potentially an issue, both in relation to accessing the main road network through a cul-de-sac, but also in achieving a suitable width of road to access the site, as there appears to be limited space. The potential impact of the sewage works, located to the west, is also a factor that needs investigating in relation to the suitability of houses here.
- BID 12, was considered to have some planning merit. It would represent an acceptable extension to the existing built form. This area also sits in a dip in the landscape which would ensure development here would have limited visual impact from the surrounding area. The site is also closely related to the services within the village.
- The frontage of BID 22 was considered to have some planning merit. Development here could continue the linear development present to the south and emulate the linear development to the north of the road.

Workshop Exercise

BID11b

Both groups agreed with the offices comments in relation to this site. One group strongly favoured this site and felt it represented an appropriate infill plot and would have limited visual impact. Access was raised as a concern but the participants felt that this was no more an issue here, than elsewhere in the village. Both groups favoured the aspiration to retain the clearly defined boundary edge of the settlement, and therefore requested development to the rear of the site should be level with the exiting built form.

BID16

The groups agreed that this site had some merit. They felt it represented an appropriate infill plot and would be well related to the village, with little visual impact. One group felt that development may be able to offer an attractive front to the square. The participants accepted access may be an issue, however one group wanted the Council to explored if access could be achieved from the existing housing estate to the east.

BID22

The general consensus from both groups felt that the frontage may have some planning merit. A minority of people didn't favour this site however, as they felt it marked a pleasant gap in the village with attractive views over the countryside. One participant felt that land ownership would be an issue, in any event, as they were marketed recently in individual plots.

BID 12

Both groups agreed with the officers comments in relation to the planning merits of this site. One group favoured this site as it represented the closest to the village centre and associated services. However, concerns were raised about traffic congestion being raised due to development. This area is already heavily congested by residents of nearby neighbourhoods parking their cars on the street. One group wanted a requirement for the development to deliver more parking in the area.

BID23

Both groups felt that this site would make a better residential site than what is currently on site. One group urged the Council to actively re-locate this business to another location. The officer explained the context of rural employment to the participants. It was generally accepted that this site would be too small to accommodate 5 units so it is more likely to be a development control issue, than a Plan one.

BID03 BID 17 ('BID26')

Both groups felt that BID03 and BID17 had some merit and shouldn't be ruled out at this stage. They also grouped the area of BID07 to the east of this area in same context. (one group defined this area as BID26 on the map). The groups felt that this area could

be a location where a cul-de-sac type development could be located. The felt the access could be achieved and appropriate sight lines would be possible from this side of the road. One group referred back to the Parish Plan which stipulated a desire to see cul-de-sac development coming forward in Biddenden.

The evening was concluded by Simon Cole, who outlined the Key next steps in the process of producing the Tenterden and Rural Development Plan Document. For further information regarding the timetable, please see the ABC Local Development Scheme (LDS)