

Call for Sites - November 2019

Comments sent via email or letter:

Comment 1

Opposition to potential housing development in Marden: Transport - we do not have the infrastructure to cope with these massive housing developments. The narrow lanes which all the extra cars, vans etc would exit onto cannot cope, all this extra traffic would have to get to and join already crowded A and B roads. The nearest M road being thirty minutes travel time at the moment. This alone makes these developments absolutely unsuitable for such a rural area. Also the huge number of extra vehicles would add to the local pollution. The trains with all the new developments in Marden and surrounding areas have long since reached their capacity to carry all the passengers that wish to use them around rush hour times. The trains cannot be extended in length and no extra trains can be added to the timetables. Marden has now a situation that the local car park for the residents is now the free overflow parking for commuters. Environment - The loss of many hundreds of acres of green fields will have a massive detrimental landscape impact on the village, as well as affecting the wildlife loss of habitat and the problems that light pollution has on the insect population, there would be even more strain on the village sewage and water supplies. Given climate change we need to keep as much countryside intact for as long as possible. Planning - Housing developments have many times been refused North of the Railway, and the situation has not changed, in fact the strain on local services and roads is now worse due to the extra hundreds of new houses now occupied and still to be built. Many of these houses have not been sold yet so the congestion in and around Marden is still escalating. Consequences - The village of Marden is being submerged in new housing estates, the very developers that sell the ideal of country life are completely destroying that idea with their estates, that will concrete over acres of countryside should their plans be allowed to go forward. Solution - Marden has suffered as an open building site with lorries clogging up the village with noise and dirt and constant roadworks for years now while the new developments are being built. The village needs a moratorium on building to give it time to assimilate the new housing before any new ones are approved in the future.

Comment 2

I would like to lodge an objection to the site in Dairy Lane that has been submitted in the "Call for Sites". This site has been rejected by MBC in the past and the reasons for that have not changed. This site goes against all that the Government's National Planning Policy says. There are a number of other sites, not in Chainhurst, that would be more suitable.

Comment 3

We write concerning the Call for Sites submission by J Carter and D Ranwell in Dairy Lane, Chainhurst. The owners previously submitted this land in 2013 in a previous Call for Sites and it was rejected in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment of 2016. Nothing has changed in Chainhurst since that time to make this land suitable for development. Dairy Lane remains a one car width lane, unable to cope with heavier traffic, Chainhurst remains without services such as a doctor's, so any inhabitants (old and new) would have to organise their own travel to such, the bus route is still very restricted (two buses a day (weekdays only)), the land in question about a locally historic garden (Whitehurst), the surrounding area is still of "high" sensitivity (as per the Assessment of 2016), Chainhurst is still cut off in floods (so the inhabitants are marooned), Chainhurst is very wet with both run off and ground water and we doubt current drainage would be able to cope with 56 new houses, the current properties on Dairy Lane are mature and have large gardens and country views - any new development would not fit in, the land in question is subject to an Ecological Constraint Level 3 as the boundary to the land may house protected/notable species. This site is completely unsuitable for development and should be rejected again. Please note that the site in question has no direct access to the main Hunton Road.

Comment 4

We would like to strongly object to the "Call for Sites" submission in Dairy Lane, Chainhurst. We moved here last April and were informed by the utilities we were "remote". (1) Broadband is less than 3, with no prospect of increased speed as the Hunton exchange is unable to provide higher speed and we have had to have a booster on our roof at cost; (2) No nearby food shop or petrol; (3) Roads impassable if it rains too much, cut off completely if prolonged rain or snow only an SUV can get through, certainly no pedestrian or cyclist; (4) No pavements or street lighting; (5) No gas or sewerage; (6) Unpredictable bus service - none at weekends; (7) too far for ambulance for "golden hour"; (8) No school, pharmacy or infrastructure to sustain more houses; (9) very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists especially in the dark; (10) No local employment, people would have to commute in cars. Please would you be kind enough to take into account the NPPF (para 79) which states clearly: "Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside." We sincerely hope the Council will not change its mind from its very sensible decision that the site was "not suitable".

Comment 5

54 - There is only a school bus service in Chainhurst, which does not operate in school holidays. Hunton Road is busy and narrow and is quite unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians and there are no footpaths. Although the site does not actually flood Chainhurst is a low island in the flood plain and several times in the recent past residents have been unable to get in or out for days because the local roads have been flooded. With regard to the "Established B1 Industrial Estate" at Dairy Lane Farm, this is my farmyard with a few existing buildings, one of which has B1 use. When we tried to get that extended to one more building, it was Ms Carter who organised a petition to get it rejected! There is absolutely nothing for young children to do in Chainhurst, and some of the children that are here now seem to use the farmyard as a playground, which is neither practical or safe. I imagine that with new houses there would be more young families with children, and I would not want to be responsible for their safety. The west side of Dairy Lane is so narrow that two cars can not pass and the Waste Disposal lorry touches the grass on either side, it is totally unsuitable for any traffic increase. As well as this local "gripe" I am, like everyone else opposed to any more large development in Marden, where I was born and have lived most of my life, as we have more than enough to cope with now.

Comment 6

54, 304, 123 & 213 - sustainability, namely transport, flooding, local services, conserving and enhancing the natural environment, heritage and isolation. To conclude, it has clearly been established that development in the countryside around Chainhurst is isolate and unsustainable. This site (54) or any in Chainhurst for housing is unjustified when taking into account the reasonable alternatives submitted under the "Call for Sites 2019". The allocation of these sites in Chainhurst would be inconsistent with Government National Planning Policy. Site 54 was previously rejected in the last Maidstone BC Local Plan (2017). The Council's Strategic Housing & Economic Development Land Availability Assessment published in January 2016 stated under "Table H2 - Rejected Housing Sites: Dairy Lane, Chainhurst (Site Ref H035) that "The site is located in the open countryside and removed from an established settlement and associated services. Development would cause harm to the open character of the countryside". Nothing in planning policy terms has changed since the last assessment was made by Maidstone BC in 2016. These sites in Chainhurst should be rejected as suitable for housing.

Comment 7

see Annex 1 (General comments against)

Comment 8

see Annex 2 (Comments of most suitable and least suitable)

Comment 9

See Annex 3 (site 54 specific)

Comment 10

See Annex 4 (site 309 specific)

Comment 11

See Annex 5 (site 226 specific)

Comment 12

Annex 7 - general comments

Comment 13

Annex 8 - general comments