

**Ashford Borough Council**

**Addendum to  
Responses to Regulation 19  
representations – July 2017  
Report**

**Nov 2017**





**Responses to representations made to the Monitoring and Review section and Appendix 2 of the Ashford Local Plan Regulation 19 Version were inadvertently omitted from the Responses to Regulation 19 Representations July 2017 Report.**

**Responses are set out below.**

## MONITORING AND REVIEW

Representations have been received from the following consultees:

1306 Kent Downs AONB (Katie Miller)	1517 CPRE Kent (Hilary Moorby)	2432 High Weald Joint Advisory Committee (Clare Tester)
--	--------------------------------	---

### Summary of Representations – Main Issues

1306, 2432 it is a duty of the Kent Downs AONB Partnership (of which Ashford Borough Council is a member) to monitor the condition of the Kent Downs AONB. Proposed headline indicators are set out in the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan. Therefore an indicator should be included that relates to the condition of the AONB as a means of monitoring the effectiveness of policy ENV3.

**Response:** *An additional monitoring indicator which covers Policy ENV3 and compliance with the relevant AONB Management Plan is agreed. The Council will liaise with NE and both AONB Management units on the precise wording, baseline data and an indication as to how such data will be collected and recorded.*

1517 The monitoring section should indicate commitment to continued monitoring of the environment, for example water availability, air quality and traffic (such as traffic volumes, air quality, use of electric/self drive cars and car park use) which might trigger a review of the plan.

**Response:** *Noted. Environmental Indicators, including for monitoring water and air quality will be included in the Monitoring Framework.*

## APPENDIX 2 – EVIDENCE BASE

Representations have been received from the following consultees:

266	Graham Lilley	267	Graham Lilley	545	Historic England
570	Julian Green	1142	Simon Weston	1253	Ron Savill
1360	Camilla Ketchen	1713	Jane Marriott	1720	Jane Marriott
1768	Doug Marriott	1770	Doug Marriott	2860	Wheler Foundation
1941	Carol Ann Vant	2049	Alan Rogers	2059	Chris Foley and Family
2077	Thomas Bates & Son Ltd	2109	Susie Boyd	2111	Susie Boyd
2178	James Ransley	2262	Persimmon/Barton Wilmore	2729	Peter Finnes
2166	Shadoxhurst Parish Council	1633	Westwell Parish Council	1641	Michael Briest

## Summary of Representations – Main Issues

### Issue - Sustainability Appraisal Report

**Sites SS54 and SS7 (Smeeth Site allocation S38)** 266, 267 feel that this site is unsuitable because of the relationship to the village, ecological impact, loss of open fields, flood risk, dependent upon the development of an adjacent site for access. Suggest that development would result in overdevelopment of the site, would result in infill, it would result in increased vehicular movements in a problematic area and around the pedestrian and vehicular entrance to the playing fields.

**Response** please see responses to S38 on page 201-203 on the July 2017 response to representations document. No SA change needed.

**Site WC33 (Land at Forge Hill, Bethersden)** 1253, 1142, 570 feel that the site is not suitable for development because it does not comply with policy SP1. It was previously deemed as unsuitable for development, it would adversely impact character of the conservation area and the setting of a listed building and adversely impact on important vistas. It would detract from the open character of the village, would result in increased traffic, noise and air pollution, loss of open space and there is insufficient capacity in the sewage infrastructure of the village.

**Response** The comments made against site WC33 are noted, however the site has not been selected for inclusion in the Local Plan as a site allocation, and no full Sustainability site Appraisal has been undertaken by ABC. As part of the updated SHELAA 2017 the site is listed as being assessed for suitability by 'Neighbourhood Plan decision'. As the Neighbourhood Plan group in Bethersden are beyond Regulation 14 Stage of their plan, it is appropriate to leave detailed site assessment work to them. However, national regulations

*require the Local Planning Authority to list all 'Available' land which is submitted to them in their Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). The site has been promoted through the Local Plan process and is available and therefore the site must remain in the SHELAA document as an 'available' site.*

**Site DW7 (Site allocation S44 – Watery lane, Westwell)** 1633 points out that Westwell Parish Council was not consulted before site DW7 was included in the Draft Local Plan. Feels the site description in the SA (that it cannot be seen from Watery Lane) is incorrect. The site is correctly described as being in the Kent Downs AONB and close to the motorway . It is not close to the CTRL nor is it "sandwiched between" the motorway and the railway. The railway is some way away on the other side of Sunnybridge farm; to the south is the Maidstone line of 1864 and not the CTRL. As the Maidstone line is the boundary of the AONB it would cause an adverse landscape impact. The site is incorrectly described in respect to its relation to Ashford and services. The access to the A20 is 1km along a winding rural road with no footway, but traffic speeds in excess of 40mph. These access conditions do not meet sustainability criteria for development. The IMD refers to Hothfield which is the neighbouring parish over 1km away. The DW7 site is in Westwell parish which is not in a Lower Super output area and is strongly cohesive and supportive.

The statements under Objective 2 in the SA : Landscape are wrong. Under Objective 6 : Access and Social Inclusion the SA states that the site is closer to services than it is. The nearest primary schools are either at Charing, or Repton Park: both over 4km away. There are not 3 schools within 3km as stated in the SA. It may be that the survey assumed Hothfield school was available : it is no longer a primary school. Footpath access is overstated: there is a footpath within 400 m, but that has been truncated and not realigned so goes only a short distance into a field. It has been difficult to acoustically screen the site from motorway traffic.

1641, 1633 state that route 17 listed under 8.2 runs through Westwell village but is a mountain bike leisure route along the pilgrims way in either direction and not an alternative for everyday travel. The site has no public transport, the road has no pavement and the road is used by tarmac. There are no shops near and no school in Westwell. Development would adversely impact on the AONB.

**Site DW8 (Site allocation S44 – Watery lane, Westwell)** 1641, 1633 - the site description in the SA is wrong. The site as submitted suggests that it is an integral extension of the DW7 site. That is not correct. Site incorrectly described as adjacent to CTRL but it is the Maidstone line. The distances to services are much greater than stated. The cumulative visual impact of this site and DW7 would be significant as this site would be on higher ground in the open landscape and will therefore have an adverse impact on the AONB. SA implies a new access onto Watery Lane down a steep bank, this would be opposed by Highways. Route 17 is only a leisure mountain biking route in this area, buses are more than 400 metres away, along a rural road with no footway. Providing acoustic screening could be problematic. The site has no water supply nor sewerage services.

**Response** See updated SA sheets for DW7 and DW8 in SA addendum Nov 2017.

**Sites DN1 and DN30 (Sites in Chilham)** 1720, 1768, 1770, 1713 these sites are still marked as "remain in survey for housing" in Appendix 1 of the SHELAA. The sites were considered as not suitable for development and should therefore be marked as filtered at Part 2. Sites is unsuitable for development for old or young in view of narrow lanes, no footpath, lack of services in the old wives Lees.

2049 points out that in the Erratum to Appendix 4 of the SA/SEA this sites is now clearly listed as being unsuitable for development. The reasons given, including narrow roads, AONB, poor services, proximity to a listed building etc, are completely valid. Does not believe that there is a GP surgery held in Old Wives Lees Village Hall (item 6.3), nor that there is an hourly bus service from the village (item 8.3). These comments simply endorse the conclusion that the site in unsuitable for development.

**Response** *The updated 2017 SHELAA, removes both sites DN1 and DN30 in Part 2 of the Assessment process as being unsuitable for development and they no longer 'Remain in survey for housing'. The Sustainability Appraisals of the two sites, contained within the August 2016 Erratum of the Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 4, also conclude that the sites are not suitable for allocation.*

**Sites WS17 and WS21 (Sites in Shadoxhurst)** 1941 feels that the selection of WS21 in preference to WS17 is unjustified by the evidence. Mentions delivery of facilities, proximity to play area, access to footpath, TPO's, loss of mature trees, condition of the field. Had the Objective Criteria in Appendix 3d been applied to both WS21 and WS17 with equal objectivity and fairness, both sites would have been equally suitable for residential development and for inclusion in the Local Plan. WS17 has a lesser flood risk and this should have made it the preferred option. However consider that it could be argued that there is justification for including both sites.

2729 feels that the whole survey requires review and revalidation. Many items cannot be resolved without detailed studies. The site is at risk of flooding. The site is unsuitable for SUDS due to low permeability. The size of the site is wrong. Scoring on services in wrong. It is not close to shops and the current developer application includes no shop, facilities or services and the proposal for 25 houses leaves no room for community hall, shop, GP Surgery, etc in this space. Development would result in the loss of green corridor and forms part of a BOA. The site also connects through land to the south with the Biodiversity Opportunity Area of the 'Low Weald Woodland' (BOA). Archaeology and heritage assessments are wrong. 40m to the North are houses and the CA is less than 600m; data requires review and correction. Public accessibility is currently limited by lack of regular maintenance. The two footpaths that cross the site are to be diverted in the current plan and will seriously inconvenience many users. Concern that during construction vehicles will park on the pavement.

**Response** *Please see responses to S36 on page 192 - 196 of the July 2017 response to representations document.*

**Site NW1 (Willesborough Lees Park)** 2178 proposes a revised SA and increased scoring for Site NW1, promoting the site for allocation.

**Response** *No changes are proposed to the SA scoring or assessment for site NW1. The SA has been scored using the same methodology and criteria as all sites and as set out in the site assessment proforma. In particular the location of the Great Stour LWS on the north eastern boundary and the fact that the Ashford Green Corridor strategic open space covers half the site is reflected in the scoring, as is the location of approximately a third of the site in flood Zone 2/3 . It is noted that many of the constraints to this site are contained within only one part of the site, but the site appraisal must be undertaken on the whole site as it is submitted.*

*The landowner of the site (who is not the consultee of Rep 2178), has not objected to the Sustainability Appraisal or pursued this site as an 'omission' site to the draft Local Plan.*

*It should also be noted that the overall 'score' on the sustainability appraisal process is not the only determining factor for site allocation selection, and the more detailed written conclusions provide an overall analysis of the suitability and sustainability of the site, which takes into account other site and local factors which may not be covered by the scoring process, and also the overall deliverability of the site. Therefore a higher 'score' in the SA assessment does not necessarily equate to the site being more suitable for allocation than an alternative site elsewhere in the borough.*

**Issue - Infrastructure Delivery Plan** 2166 considers the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is unsound. Whilst the key elements of Infrastructure are identified, the borough-wide needs and actions are given variable attention and in several key aspects not addressed at any practical level. Both the construction phase and long-term roads capability needs to recognise the impact on the broader community impacted by short-term and permanent traffic loadings / movements. The Telecommunications Plan needs to recognise the limitations of existing fixed & mobile networks and jointly work with providers to develop the necessary capabilities forward for Ashford 2030. This is not identified, nothing appears to be anticipated. British Telecom is not mentioned as a consultee. Annex 2 Infrastructure Delivery Schedule" makes no reference to Telecomms. Communications Infrastructure is not specifically addressed as a component of the Plan and as such cross-references are limited

**Response** *The evolution of the IDP included wide ranging discussions with infrastructure providers, including the highways authority. They were aware of the proposed distribution of housing development across the borough and this informed their response to consultation. Various projects were identified as a means to mitigate the impact of the proposed development, as reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. In addition to these strategic improvements, on-site improvements will also be needed when development comes forward and these will be determined through detailed discussions with KCC.*

*With regards telecommunications provision, the various mobile phone operators were contacted as part of the IDP process, see appendix 5 of the IDP. However no specific projects were identified by these providers, suggesting that existing infrastructure provision is sufficient to meet future demand over the plan period (up to 2030) or that they intend to improve the existing provision without the need for money from development – at this stage. Should this situation change, and projects be identified by the providers, they will be reported in any review of the infrastructure delivery schedule which is intended to be updated at least annually.*

**Issue – Transport 2166** - Villages in the southern hinterland of the Borough, notably Shadoxhurst, Kingsnorth, Bethersden, Woodchurch and Hamstreet are ignored in the Traffic Impact Assessment but will be impacted not only by their own designated developments but by the parallel major Chilmington programme. Any work to construct Junction 10A and all the road infrastructure work at Chilmington, Sevington, Court Lodge, Kingsnorth, etc will also have a major impact on travel to and from, and indeed through, South Ashford as drivers try and avoid bottlenecks. It is imperative that specific impact assessments of Chilmington are undertaken and published addressing the key routes around the southern quadrant and its key component roads.

**Response** Please see responses to Policy TRA7 on page 279 -280 of the July 2017 response to representations report.

**Issue - Housing Evidence Base 2262** feels that despite the revocation of the SEP not aware of any specific assessment which demonstrates why it is not appropriate for Ashford Town to continue in its role as a growth area, especially given the aims of the NPPF, to 'significantly' boost the supply of housing. Asserts that the Borough Council has significantly under-delivered. Consider the housing requirement of 14,680 dwellings to be an absolute minimum. This will secure flexibility (NPPF, para 21) to ensure housing requirements are met and to contribute to boosting the supply of housing (NPPF, para 47).

Suggests that the assessment of housing need takes no account of the impact of planned interventions strategies and policies or follows the methodology set out in PPG 2a-014:20. Adjustment to the rates for 25-34 year olds is wrong. The adjustment to household formation rates does not fully address the issue of household suppression. More recent evidence directs that the OAN of 727 dwellings per annum should be increased. The housing and job targets in the emerging Local Plan are not in balance; It does not take into account the DCLG 2014 household projections which indicates a requirement for 835 dwellings per annum (the Local Plan currently proposes 773). There is no evidence to suggest that the SHMA has taken into account the effects of proposed Policy HOU1 that there is no affordable housing requirement in Ashford Town if the proposals are for flatted developments.

**Response** Please see responses to SP2 on pages 18 – 49 of the July 2017 response to representations report.

## **General**

2166 objects to lack of reference in EMP6 to the supply or requirements for existing users and the lack of apparent provision for S106 or other CIL contribution to the fixed & mobile capabilities, notably broadband and landline capabilities, for either new or existing users.

**Response** please see response to Policy EMP6 pages 262 -264 of the July 2017 response to representations report.

2860 expresses concern about the way different scenarios are assessed against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, the over reliance on an out of date Strategic Housing and

## Addendum to Appendix G of July 2017 Consultation Statement (Nov 2017)

Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) and the fact that the scoring system considers only urban and not rural areas. If the SA does indeed rely on the SHELAA, then a further call for sites should have been completed.

**Response** *SA scoring applies the same way to all sites, urban and rural. The SHELAA was updated in 2017 and new sites which were presented during the consultation have been included within it. The sites submitted in conjunction with this representation have been assessed alongside all other sites submitted at this stage.*

545 did not comment but provided generic guidance on incorporating heritage into SAs.

2166 states that found it extremely difficult to comment on the Plan.

**Response** *noted.*

**Support** 2077 supports SHELAA with regard to finding land at Rook Toll suitable and available for development.

**Response** *Noted.*