

## **Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group**

Notes of a Meeting of the Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group held on the **7<sup>th</sup> April 2017**.

### **Present:**

Cllr. Clarkson (Chairman);  
Cllr. Bennett (Vice-Chairman);

Cllrs. Mrs Blanford, Clokie, Dehnel, Galpin, Michael, Shorter.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2 (iii) Cllr Dehnel substituted for the Conservative Vacancy.

### **Apologies:**

Cllrs. Chilton, Heyes, Wedgbury.  
Jeremy Baker – Principal Solicitor (Strategic Development).

### **Also Present:**

Cllrs. Mrs Bell, Buchanan, Burgess, Mrs Dyer, Hicks, Miss Martin, Smith, White.

Simon Cole – Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development; Daniel Carter (DC) – Principal Policy Planner; Ashley Taylor (AT) – Principal Policy Planner; Richard Alderton – Director of Development; Helen Garnett – Policy Planner; David Jeffrey – Housing Enabling Officer; Rosie Reid – Member Services & Ombudsman Complaints Officer.

Mr. Richard Honey QC.

## **1 Declarations of Interest**

- 1.1 Cllr. Clarkson made a Voluntary Announcement as he was the Chairman of A Better Choice for Property Ltd.

## **2 Notes of the Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2017.**

- 2.1 The Task Group Members agreed that the Notes of the Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group Meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2017 were an accurate record.

## **3 Update on 5 year housing land supply – presentation and discussion with Richard Honey QC**

- 3.1 The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development gave a brief presentation, which covered:
- the current position

- proposals to achieve the required number of extra dwellings agreed over the Plan period
- additional requirements for achieving a 5-year housing land supply
- key issues to consider in allocating additional sites for housing to achieve a 5 year housing land supply.

3.2 The Chairman opened up the item for discussion. Members raised a number of questions, and Richard Honey offered his advice on these points.

3.3 In response to a Member's question on sustainability, the Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development said that infrastructure was a key factor in determining sustainability, and this was harder to identify in rural areas as it sometimes came down to the feel of the area, rather than a technical exercise. Decisions were based around the scale of a proposal, the capacity and quality of existing services and the character of the area. New sites which were likely to be deliverable over the next 5 years were more likely to be of a small/medium scale, in accessible locations, with no significant infrastructure constraints, in a variety of places across the Borough, where the market could be most likely to deliver them reliably. There should be no formal threshold figure for each village, but the strategy was to grow villages at an appropriate rate that allowed them to absorb growth rather than at the rate thrust on them by developers. This was consistent with the underlying strategy of the emerging Local Plan.

3.4 A Member said that it would be important that the Planning Committee understood the Council's current position and strategy when making decisions on individual planning applications. If officers felt obliged to recommend sites for approval, it would be important that the Planning Committee understood the background to these decisions.

## **4 Local Plan to 2030 – Residential Windfall Policies**

4.1 This item was opened for discussion and a Member raised concerns about Policy HOU4. She said that, although it was limited to developments of up to 10 houses, a village could be increased disproportionately over a 15 year period, as there were no limits to windfall development in any one area. She asked how villages could mitigate against this risk, especially where these developments did not qualify for infrastructure improvements. The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development said that conflicting feedback had been received from the respondents regarding how restrictive the proposed policies were considered to be. He advised that consistency with the NPPF was the most important factor. It was proposed that these policies should be revised to take a position which accepted appropriate windfall development, subject to a range of key criteria. There would inevitably be a tipping point at which development was no longer sustainable at a particular settlement e.g. local schools being full and the nearest school being too far away. If infrastructure could not be improved, or the character of an area fundamentally changed, this would be a naturally limiting factor. It was not practical to have a 'one size fits all' policy that applied to all settlements in the borough, and a more subtle approach was required to govern development proposals. This approach had led to the creation of the proposed new HOU

policies, which laid out a set of criteria for determining whether proposals were acceptable.

**Resolved:**

**That**

- i) Draft Policies HOU3 and HOU4 be amalgamated into a single policy and amended as set out in the report;**
- ii) Draft Policy HOU5 be amended as set out in the report;**
- iii) The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development be authorised to make the consequential amendments to the supporting paragraphs to the policies.**

## **5 Local Plan to 2030 – Strategic Parking Policies, including Park & Ride**

- 5.1 The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development introduced this item. He explained the background to the proposed policies and the recommendation that the Warren site should not now be referred to for use as a park and ride facility in the emerging Local Plan. He advised that there was no need to allocate this site for another use at present. Parking should now be focused around provision of multi-storey car parking in the town centre.
- 5.2 Members agreed that sites for town centre car parking need not be specific at present as there may be a future need for flexibility. There would be a master-planning exercise around town centre parking in due course.
- 5.3 In response to a question, the Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development advised that reference to the site for a park and ride scheme at Chilmington on the A28 could be excluded from the emerging Local Plan as that site was already safeguarded for that purpose in the Chilmington Green Area Action Plan. He clarified that this site could not come forward for housing or any alternative use until the Council had determined it would no longer be needed for park & ride purposes.

**Resolved**

**That**

- i) Policy TRA2 be amended to read as follows:-**

### **TRA2 – Strategic Town Centre Public Parking Facilities**

**The Council will prioritise the delivery of new public car parking in or adjacent to the town centre (with an overall indicative capacity of approximately 700 – 900 spaces). Proposals which would prejudice the ability to deliver these facilities on a viable basis will be refused unless it has been agreed with the Borough Council that the facility is either no longer required or the alternative provision of the same amount of car parking can be delivered in a suitable location.**

- ii) **Figure 2 of the draft Local Plan be amended to exclude the area of land identified in the Chilmington Green Area Action Plan for a potential Park & Ride site from the part of the borough covered by the Local Plan to 2030; and,**
- iii) **The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development be authorised to make the consequential amendments to the supporting paragraphs to the policy.**

## **6 Community Infrastructure Levy – Government Review and Implications**

- 6.1 The Principal Policy Planner (AT) introduced this item and highlighted key points of the report and recommendations. It was proposed to put CIL arrangements on hold until the Government made a further announcement to clarify future arrangements.

### **Resolved**

**That**

**The processes to adopt CIL in Ashford Borough should be put on hold, and consultation on the draft Charging Schedule should not take place in the summer. The issue should be considered further following the Government's announcement on likely reform/abolition of CIL, expected at the time of the Autumn Budget 2017.**

## **7 Local Development Scheme Update**

- 7.1 A Member asked whether the proposed timetable was confidential at the moment. The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development confirmed that the information was not confidential, as it would be going to Cabinet in May. The submission date would be determined by whether Members wished to change the Local Plan following further public consultation on the proposed revisions to the Plan. Members of the public would have the opportunity to feed back their views during the consultation phase in summer 2017 and again during the examination period.

### **Resolved**

**That the report be noted.**

Councillor Clarkson (Chairman)  
Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group

---

Queries concerning these minutes? Please contact Rosie Reid:  
Telephone: 01233 330565 Email: [rosie.reid@ashford.gov.uk](mailto:rosie.reid@ashford.gov.uk)  
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: [www.ashford.gov.uk/committees](http://www.ashford.gov.uk/committees)

## Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group

Notes of a Meeting of the Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group held on the **18<sup>th</sup> April 2017**.

### Present:

Cllr. Clarkson (Chairman);  
Cllr. Bennett (Vice-Chairman);

Cllrs. Mrs Blanford, Bradford, Clokie, Dehnel, Galpin.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2 (iii) Cllrs. Bradford and Dehnel substituted for Cllr. Shorter and the Conservative Vacancy respectively.

### Apologies:

Cllrs. Miss Martin, Michael, Shorter.

### Also Present:

Cllrs. Mrs Bell, Bell, Burgess, Hicks, Pickering, Smith.

Simon Cole – Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development; Ian Grundy (IG) – Principal Policy Planner; Ashley Taylor (AT) – Principal Policy Planner; Daniel Carter (DC) – Principal Policy Planner; Helen Garnett – Policy Planner; David Jeffrey – Housing Enabling Officer; Jeremy Baker – Principal Solicitor (Strategic Development); Rosie Reid – Member Services & Ombudsman Complaints Officer.

## 1 Declarations of Interest

- 1.1 Cllr. Clarkson made a Voluntary Announcement as he was the Chairman of A Better Choice for Property Ltd.

## 2 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

- 2.1 The Principal Policy Planner (IG) introduced this item and highlighted the key points in the report and recommendations. The Chairman opened up the item for discussion and the following points were raised:

- The Chairman emphasised that it was vital for the Council to make efforts to identify sites, over and above those which had already come forward. He considered that there were sites available in the Borough which could be suitable for use, and officers and Members should take a proactive approach to identifying them.
- Members agreed that in rural areas partnership working was essential between Ward Members, officers and Parish Councillors, in order to obtain a consensus view on the suitability of sites. It was noted that Ward Members could often provide officers with valuable background information, and effect meetings with current site residents. Another Member said it was important that all Members worked with planning

officers to identify sites, including in urban wards, to achieve equity across the Borough. He considered that there may be potential sites in the hinterland between the villages and the town centre core.

- A Member pointed out that some areas of the Borough already had a large gypsy and traveller population, relative to the total population of the area. It was agreed that this was an important consideration, and for this reason some areas would not be considered for further sites.
- A Member suggested that sites should ideally be kept as small family developments, and the Chairman responded that the norm was for a maximum of 5 pitches on any site, which would equate to 10 units.
- A Member said he was concerned that the effort to find sufficient gypsy and traveller sites may result in retrospective planning applications being allowed. The Chairman said he considered that the Council had taken a proactive approach to enforcement in recent years, and this would remain the case in the future.
- The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development said that Members had provided clear guidance at the meeting. He said that, although the proposed Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation DPD would become a separate document from the main body of the Local Plan, it should run in parallel with the Local Plan process as far as possible, so as not to delay the resolution of issue.

## **Resolved**

### **That**

- i) The relevant section of the draft Local Plan be amended to refer to the production of a separate Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation DPD to allocate additional sites to meet gypsy and traveller accommodation needs to 2030;**
- ii) Subject to (a) above, consequential amendments are made to the proposed Local Development Scheme due to be considered by the Cabinet and Full Council in May; and,**
- iii) Policy HOU17 and its supporting text is amended to clarify that it does not apply to sites granted temporary planning permission for any reason.**

## **3 Local Landscape Protection Policies**

- 3.1 The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development introduced this item. He said this issue had been raised with the Task Group by one of the Ward Members. The issue was two-fold: firstly, was there a case that the Local Plan should include a series of Local Landscape Protection Policies (LLPP), with a definitive geographical boundary? If not, could the Local Plan be drafted or amended to include the key criteria put forward in the LLPP approach. Officers had considered the proposals put forward for policies in

specific areas, against the existing policies in the draft Local Plan and NPPF guidelines, and had concluded that the existing policies could be amended to provide an adequate basis to cover the points raised, whether landscape, historic, archaeological, biodiversity, traffic or character points. A combination of local and national policies would come to the same conclusion as any attempt to try and define issues on a spatial or geographic basis. Officers considered that the Local Plan's approach would be more sound and justified if these points were addressed across the whole of the Borough, rather than seeking to address them in one specific part of the Borough. Whilst the work done to justify such an approach had some merit in identifying where local residents or the Parish Council felt there were specific local issues or features of importance, the level of protection given by a combination of local and national policies was more than adequate, and provided a sound approach. It was the view of officers that the LLPP approach should not be progressed.

3.2 The Chairman opened up this item for discussion and the following points were raised:

- A Member said he considered that LLPPs could be seen as a rearguard action rather than a positive Neighbourhood Plan (NP). In his opinion there was no justification for going forward with the LLPP approach, and he considered the approach put forward by the Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development to be entirely sound. The Chairman said it appeared that some NPs were not identifying and encouraging housing to the extent envisaged by Government, and were, in fact, being used to curtail development. He said he understood that some villages had grounds to resist new development, but there were other villages which could accommodate greater volumes of housing. Villages should be free to draw up LLPPs, and the Council would give these documents a degree of weighting. However, Planning Committee decisions would continue to be made on individual merit. He concluded that LLPPs should not be curtailed, but it should be understood that LLPPs may not have the degree of weight that the authors would wish.
- A Member asked about special farmland protection. The Chairman said care should be given to applying titles which implied protected status to parcels of land. This status would not necessarily guarantee protection against development in future.
- A Member said that Planning Committee agendas usually stated relevant landscape designations which applied to any application. Committee members took account of these designations when assessing applications. The Member considered that Parish Councils could do more to draw their concerns to the attention of the planning department if they felt strongly about any particular issue. The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development drew Members' attention to criteria (j) under proposed policy ENV3a, page 10 of the agenda. This criterion emphasized the factors that any local planning authority should take into account in decision making. It was an invitation to Parish Councils or local groups to draw to officers' attention any important local feature which currently did not have



protection. This would enable officers to take into account whether any planning proposal would affect such a feature. Another Member disagreed that Parish Councils could do more to highlight their concerns over features which should be protected. In her ward there were examples of instances when the Parish Council's concerns had not been accommodated by officers. She considered that the views of Parish Councils were extremely relevant as they often represented the views of the village residents.

- The Chairman concluded that the approach put forward by officers was a good compromise, but due regard would still be given to the views of Parish Councils where landscaping or environmental issues were of concern. However, their concerns could not be given undue weighting and would be judged on their merit, and in accordance with the development needs of the Borough. He confirmed that the Planning Committee generally did have due regard to the views of the Parish Council, although they were guided by the policies of the Council.

## **Resolved**

- To agree the proposed amendments to Policy ENV3 of the draft Local Plan which responds to consultation comments and the requirements of national planning policy; and,**
- To agree that the remainder of the Plan, as written, and existing landscape designations, are sufficient to address the concerns of the PBA report for Saxon Shore.**

## **4 Local Plan 2030 – Providing a range and mix of dwelling types and sizes**

- 4.1 The Principal Policy Planner (AT) introduced this item and highlighted the main points of the report and recommendations. She said the report covered a range of policies which related to providing a range and mix of dwelling types and sizes. The first issue for Members to consider was whether a generic topic policy was required, dealing with housing mix. This issue had arisen through representations on the Local Plan made last summer during the consultation period. It was commented that the Plan did not include a general policy that required a mix of dwelling types and sizes to be provided on residential sites in the Borough. Officers agreed that this was an omission, and that such a policy was desirable. It was not considered appropriate that the policy should specify what that precise housing mix should be and this would be decided during negotiations at the application stage. Paragraph 2.8 of the report set out the criteria which would be taken into account in determining the appropriate mix of housing. It was also proposed to incorporate accessibility standards within the policy, which were currently set out in Policy HOU14. It was proposed to incorporate these standards into the overall mix policy. Representations on the draft policy last summer raised concerns about the specific levels proposed. Officers had considered the evidence and now recommended changes to the overall percentage of new homes that should be built to the Part M Level 2 standard.

4.2 The Chairman opened up the item for discussion, and the following points were raised:

- A Member asked for a definition of accessible homes. The Principal Policy Planner responded that there was a brief summary on page 24, paragraph 7.1 of the agenda.
- The Principal Policy Planner advised that minimum standards for access for all dwellings were already governed by Building Regulations. However, the draft policy proposed additional optional requirements where there was an evidence of need. Members questioned why the optional requirements should not apply to all new build properties, rather than just a proportion as this would appear to make better sense in view of the marginal costs and an ageing population. The Chairman said that the Council should strongly defend the desire to have a higher level of accessibility in new build houses in the Borough and be prepared to justify this decision to an inspector. Members' concluded that the policy should remain as drafted in policy HOU14.
- Another Member noted that as part of any evidence base, officers might note that KCC had an adaptations budget and spent large sums adapting houses as required. Another Member pointed out that the Council also had a statutory obligation to provide disabled adaptations for private sector housing, as well as any Council-owned property. The Council had a long waiting list for disabled adaptations and it would be more cost effective to plan ahead and provide better access on all new builds.
- In response to a question regarding the recommendations, the Principal Policy Planner advised that it was proposed to delete policy HOU14, which was the accessibility policy, and incorporate it within the general housing mix policy, along the lines that Members had instructed. It was proposed that policy HOU13 be deleted and incorporated into the residential space standards policy.
- A Member questioned why arrangements could not be made for purchasers to choose their own house from a developer. The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development drew Members' attention to Policy HOU6, on page 27 of the agenda. The Council was obliged, through recent legislation, to make provision for a number of plots available for sale to self or custom builders in relation to a register kept by the Council. The approach set out in the policy, on sites of above a certain threshold, the requirement for the developer to make a minimum proportion of sites available for sale to self or custom builders. Self-builders would have a certain amount of freedom to build to their own design, within the design parameters agreed in the outline planning permission and/or an associated planning brief. Some Members welcomed the idea of self-build, and considered that such properties could provide a different visual aspect to developments. Another Member expressed concern that there may be little control

over the frontages of developments. He was also concerned over the degree of control developers could have over land prices.

## **Resolved**

### **That**

- i) A new policy requiring the provision of a range and mix of dwelling types and sizes be included in the proposed changes to the draft Local Plan 2030 as set out in the appendix to the report;**
- ii) The requirements of draft policy HOU13 are amalgamated into the reasoned justification of policy HOU12, as set out in the report and consequentially policy HOU13 is deleted from the draft Plan;**
- iii) Draft policy HOU6 is amended as set out in the report;**
- iv) No changes are to be made to draft policies HOU12 and HOU14;**
- v) The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development be authorised to make the consequential amendments to the supporting paragraphs of the policies mentioned in the report, as necessary.**

## **5 Local Plan 2030 – Site at Leacon Road (Policy S11)**

5.1 The Principal Policy Planner (AT) introduced this item, and explained the background to the proposed amendments to the policy.

5.2 The Chairman opened up the item for discussion, and the following points were raised:

- Members were concerned about the mix of residential and commercial use, and the potential noise that might affect the amenity of the residential area. The Principal Policy Planner advised that the railway stabling was likely to be restricted to the north-east of the site and there would be a separation between that area and the residential development. It was considered that there would be relatively little noise coming from the railway site.
- A Member asked why the whole area could not be allocated for commercial use. The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development advised that officers had considered this option, although the site was already allocated for housing in an existing Development Plan Document. He recommended that the site be retained for housing at present, although the proposals could be considered at a future date if a viable residential scheme did not come forward.

## Resolved

### That

- i) **Draft Policy S11 be amended to solely relate to the proposed residential development along the Leacon Road frontage, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report.**
- ii) **A new policy for the 'Former Bombadier Works Site' be included in the draft Local Plan, for a mix of operational railway use and commercial development (B1-B8), as set out in Appendix 3 to the report.**
- iii) **The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development be authorised to make consequential amendments to the supporting paragraphs to these policies.**

## 6 Dates of Next Meetings

10<sup>th</sup> May at 10am  
25<sup>th</sup> May at 10.30am

Councillor Clarkson (Chairman)  
Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group

---

Queries concerning these minutes? Please contact Rosie Reid:  
Telephone: 01233 330565 Email: [rosie.reid@ashford.gov.uk](mailto:rosie.reid@ashford.gov.uk)  
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: [www.ashford.gov.uk/committees](http://www.ashford.gov.uk/committees)

## **Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group**

Notes of a Meeting of the Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group held on the **10<sup>th</sup> May 2017**.

### **Present:**

Cllr. Clarkson (Chairman);

Cllrs. Mrs Blanford, Clokie, Dehnel, Galpin, Heyes, Hicks, Michael, Shorter.

In accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2 (iii) Cllrs. Dehnel and Hicks substituted for the Conservative Vacancy and Cllr. Bennett respectively.

### **Apologies:**

Cllrs. Bennett, Murphy.

### **Also Present:**

Cllrs. Mrs Bell, Bradford, Burgess, Miss Martin, Pickering.

Simon Cole – Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development; Ian Grundy (IG) – Principal Policy Planner; Daniel Carter (DC) – Principal Policy Planner; Carly Pettit – Policy Planner, Jennifer Shaw – Housing Strategy Manager, David Jeffrey – Housing Enabling Officer; Paul Courtine – Senior Solicitor (Strategic Development); Danny Sheppard – Senior Member Services Officer.

## **1 Declarations of Interest**

- 1.1 Cllr. Clarkson made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Director for A Better Choice for Property Ltd.
- 1.2 Cllr. Heyes made a Voluntary Announcement as he lived close to site (a) – site adjacent to former Ashford Hospital.
- 1.3 Cllr. Shorter made a Voluntary Announcement as he was a Director for A Better Choice for Building Consultancy Ltd and Kent Play Clubs.

## **2 Notes of the Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group Meetings – 7<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017**

- 2.1 A Member said that at the 7<sup>th</sup> April meeting it was agreed to remove the Warren site from Policy TRA2, but this had not been included in the Minutes. The Task Group agreed that this should be added
- 2.2 Subject to the amendment above, the Task Group Members agreed that the Notes of the Local Plan and Planning Policy Task Group Meetings held on 7<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> April 2017 were an accurate record.

### **3 Local Plan to 2030 – Proposed Additional Site Allocations to Achieve a Five Year Housing Land Supply**

- 3.1 The Chairman introduced the report and advised that nothing within it was definitive. It was a confidential report born out of a need to re-look at potential sites for housing allocation and consider whether to send them out for public consultation or not. The presentation and discussion with Richard Honey QC, (Advisor to the Council), at the last meeting had highlighted the need for the Local Plan to identify additional housing allocations that were genuinely deliverable over the next five years. Perhaps not all of these would be built out, but a larger number of smaller sites would be needed to assist the Council's position in demonstrating a five year housing land supply for a longer period.
- 3.2 The Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development advised that today's meeting should bring to a conclusion the long process of identifying sites for the Local Plan. Officers believed that the sites identified in the main body of the paper would meet the minimum housing targets required and Appendix 1 to the report presented a series of further options to help present a more robust position on housing land supply. There was a need for this meeting to at least allocate enough sites to meet the minimum level, but it would be preferable to aim slightly above.
- 3.3 The Task Group then went through each site in turn and the following comments were made: -

#### (a) Site adjacent to former Ashford Hospital

There had been discussions with the NHS over their future plans for this site, but they were still unclear. If they had meaningful plans to deliver a new health facility on this site it was incumbent on them to make that clear, but this was yet to happen. It therefore seemed sensible to include this site in the consultation at this stage. The Chairman agreed and said he would also be happy to write to their Chief Executive, Matthew Kershaw to ask him directly if they had any plans for this site.

**Agreed – to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

#### (b) Aldington – East of Goldwell Lane

It was clarified that this particular site referred only to the solid red line on the plans and did not include the dotted red line as well. One of the Ward Members said there was a lot of concern locally about any further development in Aldington as they considered they had already taken their fair share in recent years with very little in the way of improvements to infrastructure. There was also concern that opening up this area would set a precedent for even further development in the area. Just over the border in Shepway was also the Otterpool development so she hoped that this particular site could be taken out for the time being.

**Agreed – to allocate the site (shown in the solid red line) in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(c) Brabourne/Smeeth Playing Field (and alternative site at Caldecott School, Smeeth)

The proposal was for housing in the area shown hatched in yellow on the plan, with associated additional sports facilities. One of the Ward Members, who was unable to be present, had submitted his strong views that this particular site should not be allocated and had submitted alternative suggestions. There was also concern from the Group that there was perhaps too many sports facilities proposed as they could bring excessive traffic to this fairly small site. In addition, any additional proposals for development in this area should be reconsidered in light of the outcome of the Gladman appeal for the site in Brabourne Lees. One of the other sites put forward had been Caldecott School, Smeeth which needed some further investigation but seemed to lend itself to development of circa 30-50 properties.

**Agreed – to allocate both sites in the draft Local Plan for consultation and include only the preferred option as a final proposed allocation, subject to the outcome of the Gladman appeal in Brabourne Lees.**

(d) Brook – Nats Lane

It was noted that screening and landscaping would be important in this location but a modest development of a maximum of 10 sympathetically designed dwellings would not seem unreasonable.

**Agreed – to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation at a maximum of 10 dwellings.**

(e) Challock – Clockhouse

**Agreed – to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(f) Chilham – land adjacent to Doctor's Surgery

There was unanimous support for this site although it was noted that parking would have to be carefully managed.

**Agreed – to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(g) High Halden – West of Ransley Farm, Ashford Road/Stevenson Brothers Site, A28

The West of Ransley Farm site was not favoured and it was considered the Stevenson Brothers site on the second list would be preferable for High Halden.

**Agreed – to allocate the Stevenson Brothers site in the draft Local Plan for consultation, but not West of Ransley Farm.**

(h) Kenardington – High House Farm

**Agreed - to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(i) Mersham – Rectory Close

**Agreed - to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

- 3.4 The Task Group then considered the sites outlined in Appendix 1 to the report which was a list of further 'optional' allocations and the following comments were made: -

(1) Tenterden (Option 1) – Appledore Road

The Task Group considered that the second option for Tenterden (Westwell Court) would be preferable

**Agreed – to not allocate this site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(2) Tenterden (Option 2) – Westwell Court

**Agreed - to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation instead of Option 1.**

(3) Blackwall Road (South of Conningbrook)

**Agreed – that this site would not be suitable to be allocated in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(4) Aldington – Goldwell Lane (Red Dashed Boundary)

Following discussion on the rest of this site under item (b) above it was agreed that it would also be useful to obtain the views of local people on the remainder of the site.

**Agreed - to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

(5) Stevenson Brothers Site, A28 High Halden

It had already been agreed in the previous discussion under item (g) that this site should go forward for consultation instead of the alternative site in High Halden, West of Ransley Farm.

**Agreed - to allocate the site in the draft Local Plan for consultation.**

- 3.5 In summarising the discussions, Task Group Members asked if they could be supplied with a simple table summarising exactly what had been agreed to date in terms of site allocations for consultation. This was agreed and the Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development said he would also like to provide a composite list of all proposed changes to the Local Plan, which would serve as a summary of all of the discussions and work of this Group over the last year or so. He thanked Members for their guidance and steer at



all of the meetings and said that this would all feed in to the final Cabinet report on the 15<sup>th</sup> June.

## **Resolved**

**That the sites identified above be allocated and that consequential new policies and supporting text be included in proposed changes to the draft Local Plan.**

## **4 Local Plan 2030 – Revised Affordable Housing Policy**

- 4.1 Due to the lateness of the hour the Chairman agreed to defer this item to the next meeting of the Task Group on 25<sup>th</sup> May.

## **5 Date of Next Meeting**

25<sup>th</sup> May at 10.30am

Councillor Clarkson (Chairman)  
Local Plan & Planning Policy Task Group

---

Queries concerning these minutes? Please contact Danny Sheppard:  
Telephone: 01233 330349 Email: [danny.sheppard@ashford.gov.uk](mailto:danny.sheppard@ashford.gov.uk)  
Agendas, Reports and Minutes are available on: [www.ashford.gov.uk/committees](http://www.ashford.gov.uk/committees)