

BRENCHLEY AND MATFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18): RESPONSE
Approved by the Council: November 4, 2019

PRESENTED BY CHANTAL BROOKS, CLERK TO THE COUNCIL
Matfield Pavilion
The Green
Matfield
Kent
TN12 7JU

clerk@brenchleypc.org.uk

1. Introduction

- a. The Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposals set out in the Draft Local Plan (DLP). Members are appreciative of the significant amount of time and other resources that have been dedicated to formulating the Plan and recognize the considerable energy that has been brought to bear on evidence-gathering, research, and the compilation and analysis of data.
- b. Regarding the “Vision and Objectives” of the DLP, the ambition for the borough to be “vibrant and prosperous” is well-said. We are encouraged by the consideration given to expanding the base for economic activity, and for enhancing the facilities to support sustainable growth. However, given the constraints imposed by the AONB and the Metropolitan Green Belt, we would question the validity of the scale of housing development being proposed, and, as noted below, TWBC’s acceptance of the centrally-imposed target for that housing. The proposed strategy will cause considerable harm to the protected status of the landscape, by doubling the size of Paddock Wood, and creating a wholly-new settlement in Tudeley. The Council will stand with communities in those areas to resist those developments.
- c. In formulating this response, the Council engaged with the local community through two public meetings, to present the DLP to residents and businesses. These meetings were in addition to the exhibitions provided by TWBC. At each meeting the Council’s independent planning advisor made a presentation summarizing the contents of the DLP and highlighted the key issues – as they relate to the borough as a whole, and the particular relevance for the parish. Subsequently, the Council received copies of the responses submitted by residents to TWBC. The key issues from those responses have been incorporated into this response.
- d. Concern has been expressed by residents about the “under-powered” nature of the consultation arrangements – even taking account of the exhibition events. More resources must be found for the next phase of consultation, to provide additional opportunities for residents, community groups, and businesses to properly engage in determining the future direction of our borough.
- e. In common with other Local Councils in the borough, this parish is engaged upon the preparation of a Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (DNBP). As the completed NDP will need to be in general conformity with the Local Plan, this response makes reference to policy matters relevant to that requirement.

2. The Local Plan Development Strategy

- a. We are not convinced that the case for the approach of dispersed growth across the borough has been soundly made. It is too far removed from the aims of the adopted Core Strategy which recognizes that rural settlements, such as those in Brenchley and Matfield, are least able to support sustainable development. The majority of responses to the five strategy options set out in the Issues and Options consultation did not favour dispersal or

semi-dispersed growth across the borough. Crucially, dispersed growth would not conform to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- b. Attention is drawn to paragraphs 102 and 103 of the NPPF (February 2019) which concern the need for plans to locate development so as to reduce the need to travel and to increase the scope for walking, cycling and public transport. In addition, paragraphs 171 and 172, which seek to conserve and enhance Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) by limiting the scale and extent of development within such designated areas: 77% of the parish is within the High Weald AONB. Accordingly, the Parish Council objects to the dispersed growth strategy for housing development, as set out in the Draft Local Plan. This is because it directs a disproportionate amount of growth to rural settlements with limited facilities and jobs, and with poorer access to public transport. These rural settlements have higher dependence on the private car and access to them is generally along low capacity rural roads and lanes.
- c. The issue of a high dependency on the private car highlights a significant weakness in the strategy. It can be argued that whilst a number of the general policies in the DLP (for example STR6 and EN2) are aimed at reducing car dependency, one of the effects of the dispersed growth strategy would be to substantially undermine the intentions of those policies.
- d. It is extremely disquieting to read in Section 3 of the Development Constraints Study (DCS) that “as it stands, there is not yet the evidence in place to arrive at a definitive conclusion as to how highways capacity could impact on the development strategy for the new Local Plan. The Council will work with its partners, including Kent County Council and Highways England, to carry out relevant technical work and assessments...” From that statement it is assumed the reverse is also not quantified - that is, the impact of the adopted development strategy on the highways capacity is similarly not known. This is a significant weakness in the DLP and raises questions over the deliverability of the planning strategy.
- e. A further significant weakness is the incomplete Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). It is disappointing to note in the column marked “Expected Funding Gap” that the contribution of all of the third-party agencies is given as “TBC”. Residents and businesses cannot see how the DLP can be considered credible and deliverable without an IDP specifying core infrastructure assets being in place and ready by construction or occupation of the first phase of house-building.
- f. Given the situation with the IDP, we would urge TWBC to quantify the impact of the proposed developments on the residents and businesses in Brenchley and Matfield. In particular: the prospect of increased congestion at the junction of A21 and the B2160 at Kippings Cross; the B2160 through Matfield; and other roads that would be affected by proposed developments in Paddock Wood and Horsmonden.
- g. The most significant consequence of the policy of dispersed growth is that the area covered by five local councils in the north-east of the borough would take the lion’s share of housing development. An arc, roughly comprising Horsmonden, Brenchley and Matfield, Paddock Wood, Capel, and Pembury, has been allocated in excess of 7,000 units. However, we cannot find any acknowledgement in the DLP that this “quadrant” is to be the focus of the proposed development strategy, or, if so, that it is the priority area for infrastructure investment. Nor is there any indication of the cumulative impact of development across the arc. Whilst it is recognized that a master-planning approach would be taken in the development of the strategic sites, this does not go far enough in dealing with such issues as the social, economic, and environmental infrastructure needed to support development on that scale.
- h. There is also no indication that the potential coalescence of settlements and parishes has been properly addressed. An obvious example of this is the proposed extension of Paddock Wood into Capel. Within Brenchley and Matfield we are concerned that it appears (on a map on p.174) that Mile Oak, one of the historic hamlets in the parish, and a section of Chantlers Hill, would coalesce with new development in Paddock Wood – both of which would be vigorously resisted. We are also concerned that the extent of development to the

south of Paddock Wood could erode the size of the gap in the landscape which separates it from Matfield. The development strategy must include the provision of a landscape policy to prevent the coalescence of settlements.

- i. In addition to being contrary to the aims of the AONB designation, the proposed development strategy also rides roughshod over policy aimed at protecting the Metropolitan Green Belt. It is not clear to us what the “exceptional circumstances” are that would warrant such an approach. The intention not to replace land lost to development runs counter to the conclusions of TWBC’s own review of the Green Belt, for which no convincing evidence is offered.
- j. Given the foregoing, it is clear to us that an adopted policy of dispersed growth would cause the irreversible loss of character and separate identity of some of our villages and hamlets. This will also loosen the bonds of vibrant localities that promote cohesive social interaction and which underpins the well-being of communities. We therefore do not think that the proposed development strategy would be in the public interest and, if implemented, would cause significant harm to both the AONB and Green Belt designations. TWBC is strongly urged to consider retaining a development strategy which continues to recognize the need to protect the rural areas, and which concentrates development in sustainable locations, either in or adjacent to the main urban area (Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough), or along transport corridors with high capacity.

3. Mitigating the Impact of Development

- a. Should the proposal to concentrate development within the north-east quadrant be taken forward, the Council would argue strongly that it be conditional on significant improvements to the A228 – indeed, we would press for a re-alignment of the road to support the scale of development. It should also be conditional on all other forms of infrastructure, such as water supply, and sewerage disposal and treatment, to be delivered in tandem with development.
- b. We would also press for significant development contributions from the strategic sites in Paddock Wood and Tudeley, to all five parishes within the quadrant. This would be to compensate for the individual and cumulative impact on the quality of life – particularly the substantial increase in traffic – on each parish and town.
- c. The Council supports policy STR/PW1 Transport 5, which requires provision of improved vehicle and cycle parking at Paddock Wood railway station. However, we note that it only refers to retaining the Commercial Road East and West public car parks, not increasing public parking provision in the town centre. Unless public parking in the town centre is increased substantially, the existing public car parks will be entirely taken up by residents from the outlying new developments, which will mean that residents of surrounding parishes, who rely on Paddock Wood as their local centre for much of their shopping and services and who have limited access to public transport, will be unable to park. This will also impact adversely on retailers in Paddock Wood, who depend on a turnover of parking places for shoppers, rather than having most spaces taken up from early morning to evening by London commuters. The Council will therefore wish to see a substantial increase in public parking in Paddock Wood town centre.
- d. We do not support policy STR/BM1, which requires contributions from developments at Brenchley and Matfield to mitigate the impact of the developments in Paddock Wood. This exposes the absence of a clear approach to responding to the cumulative impact of development across the north-east quadrant. A sustainable approach would be to balance improvements to facilities (such as children’s playgrounds) that are within walking distance in the smaller settlements with the provision of larger-scale facilities (such as swimming pools) within Paddock Wood. It is not clear to us why contributions from developments in Brenchley and Matfield would be diverted to the Hop Pickers’ Line, which is not in the parish.

4. Meeting Housing Needs

- a. It is recognized that TWBC has had to contend with the capricious requirements of government policy. However, in disregarding the Office for National Statistics' forecast of 2016 (reducing the housing needs figure from 300,000 to 160,000), it appears to us that TWBC has unquestioningly accepted the number of housing units dictated by that policy – and has designed a development strategy which seeks to accommodate it. That doesn't appear to us to be an approach that is likely to achieve sustainable development, especially given that the borough's real needs are for affordable housing and social housing.
- b. There seems to be an acceptance that the "Standard Method" is mandatory when in fact the government has itself signalled its intention to review its approach to determining the allocation of housing – which it accepts is outdated. Moreover, the methodology for the derivation of the final housing figure is fundamentally flawed.
 - i. The base figure of 484 was derived using the 2014 figures for housing growth in England over a ten-year period. This figure had already been questioned in the light of the reduced housing growth indicated in the 2016 figures.
 - ii. It appears that TWBC has applied the "Standard Method" to the base figure, using a multiplier based on an affordability ratio of 12.74 for Tunbridge Wells borough, to generate an annual figure of 749 homes – which is misleading. The erroneous assumption appears to be that building more homes, which will inevitably be sold at the same high prices, would be a means of tackling the overriding issue of affordability in the borough.
 - iii. Furthermore, the housing figure based on the "Standard Methodology" appears to have been set aside in favour of an alternative, questionable calculation. To the base-figure of 484 has been added an arbitrary 40%, resulting in an annual requirement of 678 homes.
 - iv. We are forced to the conclusion that the base-figure is unsound and that there appears to be no justification for adding a further 40% to it.
- c. Given that conclusion, we are very surprised at the prominence given to the housing target within the proposed development strategy; it has an over-determining influence on all aspects of the DLP, distorting policy intentions to an alarming degree.
- d. We are fundamentally opposed to the construction of a policy framework based on an unsound housing target, which, if pursued, would cause irreversible damage to the landscape and habitats, pose a significant threat to wildlife – including protected species – and lead to the urbanizing of the north-east quadrant of the borough.
- e. The Council does not support the over-cautious approach to challenging what is clearly a false housing target, which takes little account of the decline in the birth-rate, the downward trend in home-ownership, or pressures of affordability which nationally are well-evidenced. TWBC must consider adopting a more realistic and sustainable approach which recognizes the constraints of the AONB and the Green Belt, and which takes account of the challenges of providing the physical and social infrastructure required to support development – the delivery of which cannot be guaranteed.
- f. Given the foregoing, we do not accept the premise that development within the AONB and the Green Belt can be justified, or that it is necessary, or that it is unavoidable. If TWBC does not intend to challenge the basis of the housing allocation it must make clear to residents and businesses the reasons for its position.
- g. Regarding the issue of the relationship between assessed housing need and "affordability", there seems to be an unfounded assumption in the DLP that increasing supply will automatically lead to more people being able to buy a house. This is at odds with housing market data and national statistics, and further consideration should be given to testing this assumption and to providing stronger evidence to support it. As one community group has

pointed out, "...we can find no evidence in the supporting documents to justify the assumption that an increase in supply of housing will cause a fall in general market house prices. Therefore, building more homes that are unaffordable for the people who need them is not the solution." We would also point to a number of research and policy papers which address the flaws in the government's housing targets, including *Tackling the UK Housing Crisis – is Supply the Answer?*, (Ian Mulhern, UK Collaborative Centre for Housing Evidence, August 2019.)

- h. There is an argument that the "exceptional circumstances" provision of the NPPF could be used to justify an alternative approach to meeting housing need. As noted above, there is evidence that the impact of "affordability" is driving a decline in home ownership – so the over-provision of new homes will do little to address local need.

5. Development Proposals for Brenchley and Matfield

- a. From the outset it should be noted that the Parish Council is not against development. Indeed, in 2017 we published *Shaping the Future*, a document setting out our policy-position. In that document we make the following declaration:

There is currently pressure across the country to increase housing supply. That pressure is particularly acute in the South-East where housing shortage is most pronounced. Given that the borough of Tunbridge Wells is in one of the most prosperous corners of the region, it is inevitable that the district will be obliged to deliver its share of government-imposed targets.

However, we will aim to ensure that the impact on Brenchley and Matfield, in the pursuit of those targets, does not destroy the character, heritage, and sustainability of our settlements. Alongside that, we will support development that adds to the vitality of the parish and which enhances the social infrastructure to underpin the well-being of the community.

- b. That declaration underpins our consideration of the development proposals for the parish. Given that, we believe that the strategy of dispersed growth with proportional development distribution would have a detrimental impact on our communities, particularly Matfield, which, in the TWBC Settlement Role and Function Study 2017, is one of the least sustainable settlements in the borough – an assessment also supported by Kent County Council. The untested projected growth (over 37.5%) would be contrary to the sustainability criteria set out in the NPPF (paragraphs 7 and 8) as it lacks most of the services and amenities required for development on that scale. We therefore reject the inclusion of all four of the sites proposed to be allocated to Matfield as they would constitute unsustainable development.
- c. The Council considers the expectation that Matfield could accommodate 91 to 150 new houses to be wholly unfounded. The proposed allocation seems to be based solely on the availability of sites put forward by landowners or their agents, rather than any criteria which recognizes the real housing needs of the parish. We therefore reject the basis on which the proposed allocation is made. TWBC should reconsider that allocation, taking into account the well-known constraints, and fully assess the potential to deliver a development package that is truly sustainable.
- d. Notwithstanding our rejection of the proposed allocation, it is very disappointing to note that the twenty units being constructed by Rydon Homes have been excluded from the projected numbers. In earlier communication with TWBC we were led to believe that that development would be included in the proposed allocation.
- e. We do not support the intention to extend the LBD for Matfield, which seems to be predicated on the need to accommodate three of the four allocated sites, rather than providing a buffer to protect the village from further expansion. The Council also rejects the extension of the LBD at Market Heath, and around the former Corsica Nursery in Matfield, for which there does not appear to be any justification. Given that LBDs would be reviewed every five years, it is possible that the Matfield LBD could be repeatedly redrawn to

accommodate other development sites. That is of particular concern to the Council and we will robustly challenge any such attempt to continually extend the LBD.

- f. We also do not support the extension to the LBD in order to accommodate sites BM1, BM2, and BM3. By our calculation the LBD would increase from 17.44 hectares to 27.03 hectares in Matfield, an increase that would be at odds with the policy objective to protect and enhance the AONB.
- g. Specifically, with regard to sites BM1 and BM3, we fundamentally disagree with their inclusion in the draft plan.
 - i. Site BM1, which is already the subject of a planning application to build 45 homes, is a key site at the gateway of Matfield village and forms part of the High Weald AONB; major development here would not conserve or enhance the AONB. The site also forms part of the “Matfield and Brenchley Fruit Belt”, with high-quality Grade 2 agricultural land, as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment SPD 2017, and incorporated within the Environment and Design policies EN20, EN21 and EN22. Collectively these policies state that such sites should be protected from development, to “conserve and enhance the essentially rural, working agricultural character of this area”. The introduction of a large housing estate would surely be contrary to these policies.
 - ii. Site BM3 is also within the AONB, and adjacent to Ancient Woodland - but with particularly poor means of access. The proposed access is through Oakfield Road, which is a narrow cul-de-sac of approximately 40 homes with significant on-street parking. It is not suitable for accommodating safe access for another 60 homes on the adjacent site. The site further abuts estate-managed parkland gardens, which are part of the 400-year-old Friars estate; any development there would risk considerable adverse impact on the abundant existing wildlife. Development of this site would be wholly contrary to paragraphs 171 and 172 of the NPPF, and in conflict with Environmental and Design Policies EN14, EN15, and EN21.
- h. Two areas of the parish that are designated OSSR1 in the DLP no longer have any recreational role. However, they are featured on the maps produced in the 2018 study commissioned by TWBC. The inclusion of the former Moatlands Golf Course is particularly misleading, if it is being counted as available Open Space for this parish, Paddock Wood and Capel. It closed in 2009, and the land shown on the map is now in private ownership, with several owners and land uses. It should also be noted that the allotments in Tibbs Court Lane have not been leased by the PC for many years and are now also in private ownership. The Council therefore requests that the policy designation be removed from the map, so as to provide clarity for residents and businesses. We would be concerned if both these areas were to become vulnerable to development, if a developer could claim they were redundant as Open Spaces. It would also be misleading to include these areas in any statutory requirement for the provision of Open Space in the parishes.
- i. In addition to the churchyard at All Saints’, Brenchley, being safeguarded as a Local Open Space, consideration should be given to extending the same designation to the two churchyards connected to St. Luke’s, Matfield. They are considered special to the community as attractive areas at the southern gateway to the village, close to the communities at Sophurst Lane and Bramble Reed Lane. Each churchyard provides an area of tranquillity containing wildlife-rich habitats, with a high level of biodiversity. The churchyard at the Church itself has several Commonwealth War Graves, and a number of Listed monuments that form part of the valued heritage assets of the community.
- j. From the representations the Council has received from residents it is clear that there is widespread concern about the development proposals for Matfield. Below we summarize the substance of those concerns:
 - i. the inappropriateness of the proposed developments, in terms of location and scale;

- ii. acute lack of confidence that the developments would be sustainable, given absence of an appropriate range of services and facilities;
 - iii. heartfelt awareness of the adverse impact on wildlife and habitats, the harm that would be done to the landscape and the loss of views, and well-articulated passion against the potential loss of the essential character of the settlement;
 - iv. the significant harm that would be done to the AONB designation, and the Conservation Area status;
 - v. powerful references to the expected impact of noise and light pollution, and the loss of “dark skies”, which are a characteristic feature of the parish;
 - vi. graphic illustrations of the devastating impact of increased traffic – not just that generated by the developments in Matfield, but also the cumulative impact from developments in Horsmonden and Paddock Wood;
 - vii. the requirement that no development can take place without due regard for updating the physical infrastructure, such as the realignment of the A228, tackling the congestion at Kippings Cross, rural lanes being used as “rat-runs”, and traffic-calming measures on the B2160; and
 - viii. highlighting the pressures on public transport, water supply and sewerage capacity, the deficiencies of broadband coverage, and the under-provision of access to primary healthcare and post office services.
- k. As has been highlighted by a resident, we have noted the potential for 55 dwellings at the Horsmonden end of Furnace Lane. A development of that scale is likely to be extremely harmful because it is a historic sunken lane of nature conservation value, which in places is not wide enough for cars coming in opposite directions to pass each other, and where blind bends contribute to the hazards. Any “improvement” to this lane will result in a loss of its historic character and nature conservation and recreational value. If development were to take place, mitigation arrangements would need to be considered – the lane could be signed as “narrow lane” for local access only or closed off to vehicular traffic near Furnace Pond so that it no longer becomes a through route to vehicular traffic.

6. Development Management Policies

- a. There is concern, both within the Council and in the community-at-large, regarding the language used in the description and definition of policies; it is often imprecise, leaving open the possibility of flexible interpretation when planning decisions are made. For example, and has been highlighted by residents, it includes phrases such as “consideration will be given to...”, “... will not normally be permitted,” “where possible...” and “encourage improvements.” Used in that way, the language is not considered sufficiently robust to achieve consistency and transparency; nor is there any confidence in achieving the specific protection to which it refers. We urge TWBC to consider strengthening the language it uses, to limit interpretations that could undermine the policies it seeks to describe and define.
- b. From the large number of policies in the DLP, the Council wishes to comment on the following, the aims of which relate to policies that will be included in the Brenchley and Matfield NDP.
 - i. EN1-3 (Design and other development management criteria, Sustainable Design and Construction, Sustainable Design Standards). We are pleased to see that TWBC have adopted the *Design Guide for New Housing Development*, produced by the High Weald AONB Unit, and will expect to see the high bar it has set given due weight in all relevant planning applications.
 - ii. EN5-7 (Climate Change Adaptation, Historic Environment, Historic Assets). We support the broad aims of these policies, which are key to both future-proofing of

developments and the retention of the “inherited wealth” of the natural and built environments.

- iii. EN21 (High Weald AONB). The defence of the AONB must be at the forefront of all planning decisions. TWBC should resist the temptation to encroach upon the protections provided by the NPPF and keep faith with the passion within the community for safeguarding this precious landscape.
- iv. H3-4 (Housing Mix; Housing Density). We are in broad agreement with these policies. However, with regard to density, we are very surprised that the potential for “building upwards” in Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough does not appear to have been explored. Given the constraints to outward expansion attending both settlements, there must surely be some merit in having a policy that encourages more multi-storey developments in the urban areas.
- v. H5 (Affordable Housing). The bold step of requiring a 40% contribution from relevant development is to be commended. In the rural areas we wish to see a high proportion of such housing being safeguarded to people with a strong local connection, and active consideration should be given to exploring an enhanced role for parish and town councils in the nomination and allocation process.
- vi. H15-16 (Residential Extensions, Alterations etc. inside and outside the LBD). The test of these policies will be their stringent application to all and every relevant application. Extensions, alterations, and replacements should, at the very least, demonstrate soundness of proposals, integrity in the use of materials, and well-founded arguments for any proposed departure from commonly-accepted standards of design.
- vii. TP3 (Parking standards). We welcome this proposed policy, which provides for a more realistic approach to parking than is currently the case.

c. Regarding STR/BM1:

- i. we are concerned that the approach to “windfall” sites leaves open the door for additional development, which could undermine the number of houses envisaged in the site policies – especially for parishes with relatively few sites;
 - ii. in relation to paragraph 3, it seems to us unlikely that proposals for the sites in Matfield would “make a positive contribution towards achieving the objectives of the most recent ANOB Management Plan”;
 - iii. the list of developer contributions should focus much more on the needs of the parish – they are much too generic and do not provide sufficiently clear guidance to developers; and
 - iv. we wish to propose an amendment to include a reference that the Council would negotiate with prospective developers, to agree terms for a suitable body to assume responsibility for owning and maintaining any relevant community facility that may arise from planning consents, such as playgrounds.
- d. In terms of prioritising the allocation of affordable housing, the Council is concerned about the exceptionally strict criteria that are being proposed, whereby only those people who are living in the parish, in unsuitable housing and who meet one or more of the other criteria, would qualify. A resident has pointed out that such an approach would exclude anyone with a long connection to the parish, who had moved away (such as students, or people forced to rent in Paddock Wood due to the absence of affordable units in the parish), would be excluded. The policy should be amended to make it clear that people who have moved away, *and* those forced to leave would qualify under the scheme – otherwise almost no-one would meet the local criteria, and thus undermine the intention of the policy.

7. Conclusion

- a. We wish to underline the considerable harm that would be done to the rural areas of the borough if the proposed strategy of dispersed development were to be adopted by TWBC. The traffic that it would undoubtedly generate, compared to more centralized/brownfield development in the urban areas with existing rail infrastructure, would severely exacerbate the well-documented pressures in the rural areas. Development on the scale envisaged is unlikely to be sustainable and would fly in the face of current environmental concerns about climate-change and global-warming.

BRENCHLEY AND MATFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
DRAFT LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18): RESPONSE

APPENDIX: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

The Council requests that the following amendments be made to the site-specific developer contributions, linked to the sites that are proposed to be allocated for development.

In submitting these amendments, we wish to highlight the Agricultural Value attached to all these sites. Should they be granted planning permission, we will wish to see the provision of the full Affordable Housing requirements, and all of the financial requirements set out in the amendments, and those already included in the Draft Local Plan.

They should be read with reference to other information regarding developer-contributions already submitted by the Council. In particular, the information relating to a Bus Service subsidy to introduce a new loop service covering Tunbridge Wells - Matfield - Brenchley - Paddock Wood - Matfield - Tunbridge Wells, with subsidised fares for young people.

Schedule of Amendments

1. £1,000 per unit for each unit, for Traffic Calming measures
2. Policy AL/BM1 - Brenchley Road, Coppers Lane, Maidstone Road - Late Site 27
 - a. Planting of two native trees for each unit, to create woodland.
 - b. Bus Service provision should be more specific, as originally provided to TWBC - £2,000 per unit.
 - c. £500 per unit contribution to upgrading Mobile Phone connectivity.
3. Policy AL/BM2 - Matfield House - Site 18
 - a. Planting of two native trees for each unit, to create woodland setting between orchard and access road.
 - b. Bus Service provision should be more specific, as originally provided to TWBC - £2,000 per unit.
 - c. £500 per unit contribution to upgrading Mobile Phone connectivity.
4. Policy AL/BM3 - Ashes Plantation - Site 353
 - a. Planting of two native trees for each unit, to extend existing Ancient Woodland, and to create new communal wooded and grassed play area on the southern part of the site.
 - b. Bus Service provision should be more specific, as originally provided to TWBC - £2,000 per unit.
 - c. £500 per unit contribution to upgrading Mobile Phone connectivity.
5. Policy AL/BM 4 - Maidstone Road - Village Hall - Site 401
 - a. Planting of two native trees for each unit, to replace the likely loss of trees and screening for nearby properties.
 - b. Bus Service provision should be more specific, as originally provided to TWBC - £2,000 per unit.
 - c. £500 per unit contribution to upgrading Mobile Phone connectivity.
 - d. Extend existing footpath on western side beyond bus stop.