

Consultation Statement
Marden Neighbourhood Plan
April 2019



WHAT IS A CONSULTATION STATEMENT?

The purposes of this consultation statement is to set out how the Marden Neighbourhood Plan (MNP) has fully engaged with the local residential and business community, nearby parishes, service providers, decision makers and other stakeholders. This statement is prepared in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Section 15 (2) states

In this regulation 'consultation statement' means a document which –

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood plan;
- (b) explains how they were consulted;
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
and
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

THE ETHOS OF THE MARDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Marden Parish Council has always taken a proactive approach to understanding that change is inevitable and not always such a bad thing. The Parish Council was represented in the production of the Marden Design Statement in 2001 and the Marden Community Plan in 2007. The Parish Council has been eager to support any community-led document which would represent the views of the village and be a useful tool to influence development within the Parish.

The intention has always been to update the work of the previous documents and it was originally envisaged that this would take the form of a Parish Plan. However, it was agreed this process would not begin until Maidstone Borough Council had updated its Local Plan, referred to at the time as a Core Strategy. In this intervening period national legislation introduced the concept of Neighbourhood Plans and work on the Marden Neighbourhood Plan began.

The Parish Council resolved to encourage the production of a Neighbourhood Plan for Marden. However it was understood that for the Plan to be truly representative the process should not be Council dominated. The concept of a Neighbourhood Plan was first presented to the village in 2012 and volunteers came forward to form the Steering Group. Membership of the Steering Group was open to all and members brought with them a range of experience and knowledge.

It was clear that the Steering Group already comprised representatives of many village groups and societies. The skills and range of expertise of members has meant that the process has been undertaken largely without the need to 'buy in' external assistance.

This breadth of experience immediately ensured a broad view, with elected members, school governors, residents, members of the village organisations, local businesses and developers being represented at meetings. This meant that the Steering Group was able to maintain a good balance of representation, although like all other Neighbourhood Plans and similar groups, it has been difficult to involve traditionally hard-to-reach groups. This has been a reason for concentrating much effort on the empirical consultation stage.

The best form of consultation is to just listen. The Steering Group has always been aware of the need to demonstrate support for the content of a Plan. However, it was a specific aim of the group that everything should emerge from the community and, therefore, the imposition of a rigid structure on the process was purposefully avoided. Steering Group members understood that it is the process of community involvement that would give the plan credibility, and took this message back to their own groups, societies and workplaces. As a result considerable time and effort has been invested in explaining the process, rather than rushing into a pre-determined

format. Consequently the Steering Group has had a presence at many village events to publicise and explain the aims and progress of the Plan.

A variety of topics were identified by Steering Group members and local residents. The Steering Group then formed topic groups depending on the interests, experiences and skills of the volunteers. The topic groups adopted different ways of gathering views and presenting information. This variety of approaches was encouraged to ensure genuine engagement – there was a specific aim not to ‘oversteer’ the process. Members met with other community representatives, local politicians from neighbouring parishes, doctors from the Medical Centre, local business owners and other key village people. These meetings were both on a formal and informal basis.

The value of this period of empirical research must not be underestimated merely because such research is difficult to quantify. This, in conjunction with the previously published documents, provided the basis for the topics and embryonic policies.

The topic groups assembled their results from the empirical research phase and then analysed other published documents in the light of their findings. These documents included Maidstone Borough Council evidence base documents, the Marden Design Statement and the Marden Community Plan; and the policies of Marden Parish Council, of particular relevance being the Developer Contributions (or S106) policy document. Other publications were also useful, many of which have been produced by the Marden History Group.

This analysis was done in conjunction with Members’ research into national policy. The NPPF had been introduced just prior to the commencement of the MNP and members realised the overriding significance of this document. The Plan has continued to be developed in accordance with the revised 2018 NPPF. For all Steering Group members this has been a period of great personal learning. This was undertaken in parallel with the constant monitoring of the Maidstone Borough Council emerging Local Plan. This was an important exercise in itself and enabled the Group to provide a detailed response to the ongoing Local Plan consultation. This has encouraged Steering Group members and local residents to gain a better understanding of the planning process and the impact of the Local Plan on Marden. This is an achievement in itself.

WHO DID THE MNP CONSULT WITH?

The manner in which the MNP has been created means that the process has been continuously open to comment and suggestion. The MNP has employed a range of consultation methods in order to ensure the MNP is a truly representative planning document. The topics and policies themselves have evolved as a result of continuous consultation.

As an integral part of the policy formation process MNP contacted all village organisations, village businesses, neighbouring parish councils, statutory consultees, local councillors and MPs. The responses of all have shaped the MNP policies.

The MNP was submitted to MBC for the pre-submission consultation (Regulation 14) on 9th June 2018 (the consultation period ran until 21st July 2018).

As part of the Regulation 14 six week pre-submission consultation process the draft MNP has been brought to the direct attention of the following bodies and organisations.

Statutory Consultees

Maidstone Borough Council	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council
Kent County Council	Staplehurst Parish Council
Linton Parish Council	Goudhurst Parish Council
Hunton Parish Council	Collier Street Parish Council
Coxheath Parish Council	Nettlestead Parish Council
Yalding Parish Council	Paddock Wood Town Council
Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council	Horsmonden Parish Council
Natural England	Environment Agency
Historic England	English Heritage
Network Rail	Primary Care Trust
Marden Medical Centre	Southern Water
South East Water	Helen Grant MP
Borough Councillor Blackmore	Borough Councillor Burton
Borough Councillor McLoughlin	County Councillor Hotson
Marden Business Forum	Marden Community Warden
Kent Fire & Rescue	Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator
Marden Police Community Officer	The Homes and Community Agency
The Coal Authority	The Marine Management Organisation
Highways England	Vodafone
BT	EE
BT Openreach	National Grid
British Gas	Centrica Plc
SGN	

Village Organisations and Other Non-Statutory Consultees

Alcoholics Anonymous	Art Classes
Badminton	Ballet
Blue House Cricket Club	Brownies
Children's Centre	Citizens Advice
Congregational Chapel	Cricket & Hockey Club
Fitness Class	Friends of Marden's Heritage
Friends of Marden Medical Centre	Heritage Centre
History Group	Horticultural Society
Karate	Marden Library
Marden Church Youth Worker	Marden in Bloom
Marden Memorial Hall	Marden Minors Football Club
Marden Primary School	Marden Primary School Governors
Marden PTA	Marden Society
Marden Village Baby & Toddler Group	Mothers Union
Motor Club	NFU
Parochial Church Council	Pilates Classes x 3
Pre-School	Reading Group
Royal British Legion	Scout Group
Cornwallis School	High Weald Academy
Mascalls School	St Simon Stock Catholic School
Maidstone Grammar School for Boys	Bennetts Memorial School
Hillview School	Invicta Grammar School
Maidstone Grammar School for Girls	Oakwood Park Grammar School
The Judd School	Skinnners School
Tunbridge Wells Grammar School for Boys	Tunbridge Wells Grammar School for Girls
Short Mat Bowls	Tennis Club
Theatre Group	Thursday Club
Vestry Hall	Village Club
Village Voices	Walking Group
WI	Youth Club
Zumba	

The Steering Group also undertook additional consultation on specific chapters with KCC as Lead Local Flood Authority and Marden Medical Centre.

HOW DID THE MNP CARRY OUT CONSULTATION?

How they were consulted

The idea for a Neighbourhood Plan was first floated at the Marden Village Fete on 2 June 2012 by the Parish Council. Interested residents were asked to leave their contact details. The first Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting was held on 16 July 2012 and Steering Group meetings have taken place since then, all of which are documented in the minutes folder (available to view in the Parish Office). *Appendix 1 provides a full list of all events.*

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Open Days 1 and 2 March 2013

A series of two open days were held in the Vestry Hall. The aim was to publicise and gain support for the creation of a NP and to elicit residents' initial views and ideas. The open days were publicised in the Marden Parish Council newsletter which is delivered to all households in the parish. The open days were also promoted using posters and display boards around the village and via the Marden Parish Council's website.

Over the two days 200 residents attended and gave their views on a range of topics. Of particular interest were the potential development sites which had recently been identified in the MBC 'call for sites' exercise carried out as part of the MBC local plan process. Attendees were asked to indicate their preference for development sites using green and red indicators. This exercise was important in order to explain to residents that the concept of neighbourhood planning is to manage and not prevent development.

STICKERS MAP (Appendix 2)

A series of topic stands were also created by Steering Group volunteers covering a wide range of issues - transport, education, conservation, amenities, retail and business as well as general feedback about the current and future shape of Marden.

The results of the open days were analysed and presented at the next open day on 22 June 2013.

Open Day 22 June 2013

Once again the open day was publicised in the Marden Parish Council newsletter, posters were put around the village and information was provided via the Marden Parish Council's website.

The objective of this open day was to present the results from the March open days, combined with the broader technical research undertaken by the neighbourhood plan volunteers, in order for embryonic policies to be formulated. The findings were presented in display format at Marden Memorial Hall once again using a variety of feedback mechanisms.

In order to ensure conformity with national and local planning policy, and to ensure consistency throughout the topic groups, each policy was presented in the same format. A definition of the topic, a summary of the relevant paragraph of the NPPF,

details of the existing and emerging MBC policies and any existing Marden Parish Council plans and policies were also provided. Input from consultees and other advisory bodies were incorporated and this, in combination with the evidence gleaned, the March open days, created the initial MNP policies. The Steering Group aimed to demonstrate how the draft policies had been formulated and to test their acceptability. This event was attended by 180 people.

The findings from the June open day were then used to refine the policies and begin writing the plan. Engagement with the community has continued throughout the writing of the MNP. Steering Group volunteers have attended the village fetes, Weald of Kent Ploughing Matches and articles have been included in the Marden Parish Council newsletters. Steering Group meetings have continued to take place. Steering Group volunteers attended a two day workshop which took place in conjunction with the Kent Architecture Design Centre, (now Design South East) on 24 and 25 July 2013. This included an analysis of each of the potential housing sites to assess their suitability.

Workshop 21 September 2013

A further workshop took place on 21 September 2013. The object of this workshop was to carry out a more detailed appraisal of the parish. In particular its landscape characteristics and natural environment, the use of green technology, an appraisal of the village conservation area, existing open spaces and the economic community. A series of topic specific workshops were organised and 18 volunteers plus Parish Councillors were involved.

The results of this workshop helped to further inform and refine the emerging Marden Neighbourhood Plan.

Walking the Village 16 March 2014

Members of the Steering Group walked around the Parish to ensure the emerging MNP policies were realistic and relevant. Following this session meetings took place with KCC, Southern Water, the EA and other bodies particularly concerning the possible designation of Marden as a critical drainage area.

Open Day 21 June 2014

A further open day was held in Marden Memorial Hall, advertised using all the normal routes, to showcase the draft Marden Neighbourhood Plan policies and to seek feedback from residents. The results of this open day was used to further refine the emerging plan. Meetings with external bodies such as Marden Business Forum, Environment Agency, Maidstone Borough Councillors, MBC officers and a local housing association followed.

Marden Musical Picnic 7 June 2015

The draft Marden Neighbourhood Plan was displayed at a community event, the Marden Musical Picnic, which was attended by more than 500 residents.

2015 to 2018

The MNP Steering Group concentrated its efforts on ensuring conformity with the emerging MBC Local Plan together with reviewing and amending the document. The MNP Steering Group met periodically between the autumn of 2015 and summer 2017.

Once the MBC Local Plan had been adopted in October 2017 work began again in earnest to prepare the final draft of the MNP for Regulation 14 consultation.

An update was given to residents by the Chairman of the MNP at the Annual Parish Meeting on 8th May 2018.

The Regulation 14 consultation was launched at the Marden Big Musical Picnic on 9th June 2018 at which many residents attended and closed on 21st July 2018.

All residents were informed of the consultation via the Parish Council newsletter, website, Facebook and posters. Hard copies were placed in strategic places within the parish and open sessions were held on 13th and 14th July 2018.

ISSUES AND MODIFICATIONS ARISING FROM REGULATION 14

The manner in which the MNP has been created means that the process of consultation has been ongoing throughout the life of the plan. This has shaped every policy in the MNP. The following responses however have been received as part of the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation and are summarised in Appendix 3.

ADDRESSING THE ISSUES RAISED THROUGH REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

Details at Appendix 3.

Most policies were amended following advice from statutory consultees to improve clarity and ensure conformity with NPPF, MBC Local Plan and any other relevant legislation. Comments from village organisations, non statutory consultees and residents were taken on board and amendments made where appropriate. Responses from residents and local organisations were broadly supportive of all the proposed policies.

The arrangement of subject headings was amended following feedback, some policy names were changed and all policies renumbered to improve the flow of the document and to aid clarity. See a comparison between Regulation 16 draft and Regulation 14 draft below.

Two new policies were created:

NE4 – following advice from Natural England

IN1- following advice from Southern Water

Three policies were deleted

E2 and E3 following advice from KCC and MBC.

P1 following advice from MBC

The wording for the deleted policies was subsumed into the overall text.

Comparison table Regulation 16 draft vs Regulation 14 draft

Reg 16 heading	Reg 16 policy number	Reg 14 heading	Reg 14 policy number
Surface Water Management	NE1	Surface Water Management	FR1
Water Quality	NE2	Water Quality	WR2
Landscape Integration	NE3	Landscape Integration	C1
Biodiversity & habitats	NE4	New	
Landscape Planting	NE5	Planting Species	B1
Soil Conservation	NE6	Soil conservation	SR1
Local Character	BE1	Historic environment	HE1

Residential amenity	BE2	Residential amenity	GD1
Sustainable Construction	BE3	Sustainable construction	S1
Conversion of Rural Buildings	BE4	Conversion of rural buildings	RB1
New Farm Buildings	BE5	New farm buildings	AH1
Seasonal Worker Accommodation	BE6	Seasonal worker accommodation	AH2
Community Facilities	A1	Community facilities	A1
Open space	A2	Open space	A2
Primary Education	A3	Primary education	E1
Healthcare Facilities	A4	Healthcare facilities	HC1
Water Supply & Sewerage	In1	New	
Sustainable Travel	In2	Sustainable travel	T1
Additional Traffic	In3	Additional traffic	T2
Station	In4	Station	T3
Affordable Housing	In5	Local needs housing	H1
Housing for Older People	In6	Housing for older people	H2
Housing for Gypsies and Travellers	In7	Housing for gypsies and travellers	H3
Business and Employment	E1	Business and employment	ED1
Retail, eat, meet and greet	E2	Local retail centres	R1
Business signage	E3	Business signage	SSF1

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF EVENTS FOR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

APPENDIX 1

List of events for community engagement

29 March 2012 – Neighbourhood Plan Introductory Training CPRE (Council for the Preservation of Rural England)

2 June 2012 – Marden Village Fete, Idea of a Neighbourhood Plan

2 July 2012 – Meeting with Policy Officer Michael Murphy of Maidstone Borough Council

16 July 2012 – Inaugural meeting of the Marden Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

24 November 2012 – 23 February 2013 – Display at Marden Heritage Centre “What Makes Marden Great?”

8 December 2012 – Display at “Marden at Christmas”

10 Dec 2012 – Neighbourhood Plan Introductory Training CPRE

1 & 2 March 2013 – Open Days at Marden Vestry Hall

14 May 2013 – Display at Marden Parish Council’s Annual Parish Meeting

6 June 2013 – Display at Picnic in the Park

22 June 2013 – Open Day at Marden Memorial Hall

2 July 2013 – Meeting with local businesses

6 July 2013 – Display at Marden Fete

24 – 25 July 2013 – Workshop led by Kent Architecture Centre

9 August 2013 – Members attend Community Asset Transfer training

14 September 2013 – Display at Weald of Kent Ploughing Match

21 September 2013 – Workshop at Marden Memorial Hall

20 November 2013 – Meeting with Local Planning Authority and Statutory Consultees

2 February 2014 – Members visit Staplehurst Neighbourhood Plan Public Presentation

4 – 6 March 2014 – Members visit Ecobuild

APPENDIX 1 continued

- 5 March 2014 – Meeting with the Marden Medical Centre
- 9 March 2014 - Steering Group working day Assessment of the Parish
- 13 March 2014 - Meeting with KCC Flood Risk Manager
- 16th March 2014 - Steering Group working day Assessment of the Village
- 27 March 2014 – Kent Design (MBC) Growing Places in Kent & Medway
- 5 April 2014 - Members attend Flood Fest East Peckham
- 25 April 2014 - Meeting at MBC with Rural Service Centre Parish Councils
- 1 May 2014 - Workshop meeting with Design Consultants from MBC
- 8 May 2014 – Marden Business Forum Meeting.
- 4 June 2014 - Meeting with Neighbouring Parish Councils
- 7 June 2014 - Display at Marden's Big Musical Party
- 11 June 2014 - Meeting with the Environment Agency
- 21 June 2014 – Open Day for draft MNP Policies
- 30 July 2014 - MBC Member Training on Enforcement, S106 and CIL
- 31 July 2014 – Marden Business Forum Meeting
- 17 September 2014 - MBC/Design South East, Neighbourhood Plan Workshop with MBC Officers, elected members, and other Stakeholders.
- 5 October 2014 – Environment Agency Open Day at Leigh Flood Storage Area
- 7 October 2014 – Institution of Civil Engineers presentation, Land Drainage & Flood Risk Management
- 9 October 2014 - Garden City Event, presentation by two of the Wolfson Economic Prize finalists Chris Blundell (Golding Homes) & Hew Edwards (Barton Willmore)
- 15 October 2014 – Meeting with Marden Borough Councillors and Golding Homes.
- 26 November 2014 - Meeting at MBC on Local Plan
- June 2015 – Stand at Marden Musical Picnic in Southons Field

APPENDIX 1 continued

July 2015 – attendance at Marden Business Forum event

17th November 2015 – Understanding Natural River Processes

24th November 2015 – Water Quality – Impacts and Solutions

18th February 2017 – Kent Association of Local Councils Renewable Power Event at Elham

13th May 2017 – Steering Group workshop

9th June 2018 – Big Musical Picnic

13th July 2018 – Evening Open Session for Regulation 14 consultation

14th July 2018 – Morning Open Session for Regulation 14 consultation

Over 30 meetings and workshops of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group were held since the inaugural meeting on 16th July 2012.

APPENDIX 2

STICKER MAP



APPENDIX 3

**ISSUES AND MODIFICATIONS ARISING
FROM REGULATION 14**

AND

**RESPONSE FROM STEERING GROUP
ADDRESSING THE REGULATION 14
ISSUES AND MODIFICATIONS**

Regulation 14 Consultation Period:

9th June 2018 to 21st July 2018

APPENDIX 3

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Natural Environment:**Policy FR1 – Surface Water Management (renamed policy NE1)****Policy W1 – Water Quality (renamed Policy NE2)****Policy C1 – Landscape Integration (renamed Policy NE3)****Policy B1 – Planting Species (expanded into two policies and renamed Biodiversity and Habitats: Policy NE4 and Landscape Planting: NE5)****Policy SR1 – Soil Conservation (renamed Policy NE6)****Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Delete “and adequate funding” from Policy FR1 (Reason: funding to ensure the permanent management/ maintenance of schemes does not conform to NPPF tests for planning obligations)	Noted and “and adequate funding” deleted.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy WR1 - In the supporting text, a footnote should be added to the first reference to the Maidstone Biodiversity Action Plan explaining that it has been incorporated into the Maidstone Landscape Character Assessment (Appendix D) 2012, as amended 2013.	Noted and added as footnote.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy WR1 - In the policy, the “re-use of any separated materials” needs clarification.	Addition to text and policy for clarification
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy C1 – Development should also contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the landscape.	Addition to policy
Natural England	Policy FR1 – We welcome the support for sustainable surface water control systems as this is a positive long term policy which will both: (a) help protect Marden from flooding and serve as a point to introduce Green/Blue infrastructure (G/BI) measures, in line with the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted and retained
Natural England	Policy FR1 - We welcome the expectation of all schemes to “adopt best current industry practice for the site specific conditions” as it ensures that this plan provides a long-term, adaptable and meaningful benefit.	Noted and retained
Natural England	Policy WR1 – We welcome the wording “strict control” regarding potential contaminant release, this is strong wording which sets a clear and uncompromising precedent for development.	Noted and retained
Natural England	Policy WR1 - We welcome that a clear precedent has been set for sustainable drainage scheme (SuDS) development and maintenance, which is in line with the NPPF(103) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy (4.78 & 5.4)	Noted and retained
Natural England	Policy C1 – We advise that proposals should be located within the existing settlement boundaries and that any diverting from this should state why alternatives are not available.	Text and policy reworded for clarity

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Natural Environment (Policies FR1, W1, C1, B1 and SR1) (continued)

Natural England	Policy C1 - We advise that landscape integration should be locally specific and include native species preferable of local provenance. This is aligned with the NPPF's commitment to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (109 & 115).	Text and policy elaborated
Natural England	Policy C1 - We advise that a specific net gain is cited within this policy such as for: hedgerows and oak trees. This is in line with the NPPF's commitment to environmental net gain (109&152).	Advice adopted and included in reworded Policy B1 (<i>now NE4</i>)
Natural England	Policy B1 – We welcome that dense hedgerow planting is the preferred boundary method as this will help protect the iconic hedgerow landscape of Marden. This is aligned with the NPPF's commitment to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (109&115)	Noted and retained in reworded Policy NE3
Natural England	Policy B1 - We advise that this policy should directly cite an aim for planting hedgerows as wildlife corridors to better connect the wider ecological network of natural areas, such as SSSIs & ancient woodlands. This is in line with aims from: the NPPF (117), the Maidstone Local Plan (6.12&6.15) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy (4.43).	Noted and included in text and reworded Policy NE4 Biodiversity and Habitats
Natural England	Policy B1 - We advise that the policy of hedgerow planting should have a net gain consideration; where when habitat is lost by a development it would have to be compensated in excess of the amount/quality lost. This would align with the NPPF's commitment to environmental net gain (109&152).	Noted and policy amended
Natural England	Policy B1 - We also strongly advise that there should be a stand-alone biodiversity net gain policy which is outlined in further detail in the comments section (<i>see below</i>)	New policy written – <i>NE4</i>
Natural England	Policy SR1 – We welcome minimising the need for imported soils and reducing soil exporting as this will ensure that the soil resource is conserved in a sustainable manner. This is in line with the NPPF's commitment to protecting and enhancing soils (143)	Noted and retained
Natural England	Policy SR1 - We advise that support is given to development with well-planned, and sustainable soil stabilisation management techniques.	Noted and included in revised text

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Natural Environment (Policies FR1, W1, C1, B1 and SR1) (continued)

Natural England additional comments:

Proposal would be far more relevant with a greater consideration for green/blue infrastructure

terminology: The NPPF defines green infrastructure as “A network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities”. Blue infrastructure is a term sometimes used to describe riverine and coastal environments with a green infrastructure network.

We suggest considerations for G/BI be incorporated into the entire MNP to ensure the plan reflects modern conservation planning terminology.

We also suggest a policy be put in place to indicate Marden’s commitment to ensuring future developments contribute to G/BI with an aim of increasing value and amount of G/BI.

Proposal could provide more consideration for biodiversity improvements: Marden parish as 2 SSSI sites: Marden Meadows & The River Beult; Marden also contains 117ha of ancient woodland. We suggest that a policy should be created to improve wildlife connectivity between these important habitats and the wider countryside as this will increase the resilience, diversity and ecological value of all of Marden’s natural areas.

By improving Marden’s natural areas in such a way you are directly contributing to the NPPF’s commitment to improve biodiversity (109 & 152) while also increasing the value of Marden’s countryside for those who live there and developing a greater sense of place.

Increasing accessibility to natural areas should also be an aim of this neighbourhood plan as it will further develop a sense of place, while also putting the people of Marden at the heart of the natural environment, allowing them to benefit from the numerous; health, wellbeing, social and economic benefits provided by natural space, as outlined in The Maidstone Borough Council Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.

However care should be taken not to make recreational pressure too great on sensitive habitats such as the Marden Meadows SSSI or the River Beult SSSI.

We strongly advise that a biodiversity net gain policy is incorporated. The policy should cite the need for any development which impacts on biodiversity to clearly demonstrate net gain. Biodiversity net gain follows the principles of mitigation hierarch. Biodiversity net gain is a policy where for any development where habitat/species are lost they must be replaced elsewhere, preferably onsite, in excess to the amount originally lost.

This policy is a very useful tool for ensuring there is no net loss in biodiversity. It can also be an excellent way to create high value green infrastructure which is also beneficial for Marden’s residents and improve the quality of Marden’s SSSIs or ancient woodlands.

By incorporating a biodiversity net gain policy you would be following the precedent set by the NPPF to move “from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature” (9).

Other consultees

Consultee	Issues raised	Response
Community Warden	Policy B1 – I support this policy for the reasons stated in the plan – Native plants that provide food & shelter for wildlife/pollinators especially.	Noted and added to expanded Policy B1 (now NE5)
Community Warden	Policy SR1 – I support this policy for the reasons stated in the plan – in order to reduce the risk of contamination and to minimise carbon footprint.	Noted

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Natural Environment (Policies FR1, W1, C1, B1 and SR1) (continued)

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document

Issues raised
<p>Policy FR1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 support <p>Comments included:</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> Essential to try and control flooding; surface flooding is a major problem in parts of the parish; water companies need to improve drainage and not rely on old sewer system; flood risk downstream; addressing the flood plain issues by having this policy is excellent; need permanent management and maintenance (including funding); maintenance of historic ditches is key to controlling flooding; include natural drainage (ponds and trees essential)</p> <p><u>General:</u> Hopefully include outlying areas such as Chainhurst; Is SuDS required on all developments – should there be a threshold?; developers must consider the impact that new schemes have on environment, both during construction and the lifetime of their intended use (and closely monitored);</p>
<p>Policy WR1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Necessary to maintain quality and wildlife of River Beult SSSI and River Teise; policy protects wildlife, farmland and gardens from contamination; steps should be taken during design and construction to reduce the potential of contamination – responsibility for dealing with contamination should remain with the producer in perpetuity through conditional planning consent; Marden's existing drainage system is barely adequate for existing needs – new developments must not be allowed to overwhelm the system; vital that water quality is maintained.</p>
<p>Policy C1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 support • 1 did not support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Essential given the scale of development; support but clarify what “buffering” means; need to maintain the landscape around Marden; very important to ensure any new development is in keeping with surrounding countryside; any fencing/hedges around properties should allow wildlife to continue to access their normal habitat; agree in principle but need to reword “buffering”; Marden is a “rural village” and is growing out of control; responsibility to the countryside as a whole; Marden needs to retain its village feel.</p>
<p>Policy B1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 support <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Any planting needs to be suitable for venue and purpose; no more conifer hedging; native species only; plant trees and hedges not build walls; planting native species will help to increase wildlife habitats; minimise the visual impact of new development; trees should not be cut down to allow for easier access to new developments; limit the use of suburban boundaries (ie 1.8m fencing and walls).</p>
<p>Policy SR1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 support <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Less lorries on our overcrowded roads; not only minimise construction traffic but also to help maintain biodiversity; soil should be native to the habitat; importing soil from elsewhere increases risk of importing Japanese Knotweed etc; to avoid unnecessary lorry movements – to ensure that topsoil is retained to enhance the green areas of the developments; no risk of contamination from foreign soil; rich agricultural soil should not be replaced with inferior soil.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

**Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section
Policy HE1 – Historic Environment (*also LC1 – Local Character*) (*renamed Policy BE1*)**

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	The Historic England Register of Listed Buildings identified 129 listed buildings in Marden Parish (not 119)	Amend paragraph 1, line 3 to read “129 listed buildings”
Maidstone Borough Council	Clarify whether the policy applies to all development, or only to the historic environment.	Amended policy
Maidstone Borough Council	Replace “reflect” with “respect” Reason: the term is overly restrictive.	Amend line 1 of Policy statement to read “respect”
Maidstone Borough Council	Page 15, 2 nd paragraph of the plan states that new development should not attempt to replicate any one of the styles, which is supported	Noted
Natural England	We welcome having developments reflect the existing character of the village as this helps decrease the landscape impact from the new developments. This is aligned with the NPPF’s commitment to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (109 & 115)	Noted
Historic England	Policy is really a design policy and does not specifically require development proposals to conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets. The consequence of these policies is that the Plan allows, indeed supports, development that could potentially be harmful to the significance of heritage assets, however unintended a consequence may be.	Noted – policy amended

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents’ comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 residents support • 1 did not support • 1 resident neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Aim should be achieved wherever practical or affordable; not sure about “functionally”; important to maintain the historic aspects of the village; historic buildings in the Conservation Area and elsewhere in the parish enhance the local character; village should retain its countryside character; materials used for new developments should be sympathetic to those used on existing buildings; agree Conservation Area should be reviewed; too late to stop 3-storey dwellings; how much longer can Marden be a village?; new development must conform to older styles; maintenance of existing style of look to village is important.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

**Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section
Policy GD1 – Residential Amenity (*renamed Policy BE2*)**

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Delete or amend reference to gated properties. Reason: does not conform to NPPF, which states that plans should be positively prepared.	Amended policy
Natural England	We advise that this policy incorporates links to existing G/BI concepts highlighted in the NPPF (99&114) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy. This is because residential amenity space can be a major component of an area's G/BI.	Comments incorporated into other policies.
Natural England	We strongly advise that garden space should be specifically designed to avoid/mitigate/compensate for damage to the existing natural environment and its connectivity such as: native species planting, providing pools/ponds and avoiding impermeable concrete based fencing/walling. This will be in line with the NPPF's recommendation to have "policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens" (53), which also in turn mitigate damage to existing Marden habitat.	Comments incorporated into other policies.

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 support <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Most important is appropriate parking; new developments do not have adequate garden space; not sure the term "residential amenity" will be understood by many; Marden needs to be an appealing place to live; retain countryside; gated developments have a physical barrier which prevents those living there to feel part of the community and increase the "urbanisation" of Marden; resident developments should look outward not inward.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section.
Policy SSF1 – Business Signage (*now moved to Economy*) (*renamed Policy E3*)
Policy S1 – Sustainable Construction (*renamed Policy BE3*)

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy SSF1 – Clarify whether policy applies to the Conservation Area only. Delete the word “only” from the policy Reason: Does not conform to NPPF, which states that plans should be positively prepared. Policy objective is still met with the deletion of the word.	Amended policy to include reference to Conservation Area. Deleted word “only” from policy.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy S1 – In the supporting text, although the 2012 NPPF refers to the Government’s zero carbon buildings policy, the emerging draft NPPF (due to be published in late July 2018) refers to supporting the transition to low carbon future.	Amended policy
Maidstone Borough Council	In the supporting text, the Kent Environment Strategy has been updated (March 2016) and also refers to a low carbon transition. The targets and dates have been amended in the updated Strategy and should be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Amended policy
Natural England	Policy SSF1 – We support keeping illumination to a minimum as this will prevent wildlife disturbance by reducing light pollution. Which is in line with NPPF’s commitment (125)	Noted
Natural England	Policy S1 – We support ensuring building design is sustainable and in accordance with government guidance as this will prevent harmful development.	Noted
Natural England	Policy S1 - We advise to directly cite in policy that development proposals which incorporate renewable or low carbon energy will be supported even at a small scale. The benefits of these individual schemes are important both locally and nationally as the NPPF states that “even small scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions” (98).	Noted – Amended policy
Natural England	Policy S1 - We advise that this policy incorporates links to existing G/BI concepts by supporting developments which provide a wide diversity of G/BI such as: green roofs, tree planting & bat boxes. Supporting the creation of G/BI is directly in line with the: NPPF (99 &114), the Maidstone Local Plan (4.23 & 6.14) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy	Comments incorporated into other policies.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section (Policies SSF1 and S1) (continued)

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Policy SSF1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 support <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Signage throughout the village should be appropriate in size and impact – out of date signage should be removed; timings of illuminated signs needs to be controlled; important to preserve the character of Marden; unnecessary or overlarge signage is detrimental to the character of Marden, especially if illuminated signage is outside business hours; no glaring signs; controls light pollution; colour and size of signage should be considered;</p>
<p>Policy S1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 support • 1 did not support <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Buildings should be based on sustainable construction and must also be affordable; if it helps to conserve heat and light must be good; important for energy conservation; specific policy on large scale renewables; not if it is detrimental to country village; buildings must be truly fit for purpose; no support to construction of buildings that are not sustainable; sensible use of limited resources; keep all buildings low level, no more than 2 storeys high.</p>

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

**Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section.
Policy RB1 – Conversion of Rural Buildings (*renamed Policy BE4*)**

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	The policy should be reworded. Reason: the policy refers to “rebuilding” in the countryside, which cannot respect the character of existing buildings or avoid the destruction of the building’s original form.	Policy amended
Maidstone Borough Council	In its current form, the MNP policy weakens policy DM31 of the adopted Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017, which sets out detailed criteria for the conversion of rural buildings.	Noted
Natural England	We advise that net gain mitigation for possible destroyed/degraded habitat due to conversion should be aimed for especially bat and barn owl roosts. This is in line with the NPPF’s commitment for environmental net gain (109 & 152).	Noted

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents’ comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Seems sensible; need to use the buildings in the best way possible and preserve their character; we do not want to encourage rebuilding; essential to help retain rural character; uphold countryside; converting rural buildings is preferable to even more new builds on land around Marden – some buildings may otherwise stand unused; unfortunately does not help some agricultural buildings being allowed to be developed without planning permission; better to have change of use than demolition; it will provide new housing without losing even more of our farm land.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Economy section.**Policy AH1 – New Farm Buildings (*renamed BE5*)****Policy AH2 – Seasonal Worker Accommodation (*renamed BE6*)****Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy AH1 - The policy could include the supporting text reference to minimising any adverse impact of development on residential amenity.	Policy reworded
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy AH1 - Supporting text should justify the inclusion of the reference in the policy to “structures should use sustainable construction materials, methods and include small scale renewable energy schemes for on-site uses.”	Policy reworded
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy AH2 – The policy should be amended by inserting “temporary” accommodation for seasonal workers.	Policy reworded
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy AH2 - Delete the word “usually” from the policy. Reason: the policy does not clarify what exceptions there may be.	Deleted “usually”
Natural England	Policy AH1 – We support the very positive and strong wording for minimising impact on surrounding countryside and overall landscape. This is aligned with the NPPF’s commitment to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (109 & 115).	Noted
Natural England	Policy AH1 - We strongly support encouragement of small scale renewable energy schemes for on-site uses as the NPPF states that “even small scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions” (98).	Noted
Natural England	Policy AH2 – We support the commitment to minimising the impact from seasonal worker accommodation on surrounding countryside and overall landscape. This is aligned with the NPPF’s commitment to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (109 & 115).	Noted
Historic England	Policies AH1 & AH2 – support development in certain circumstances (ie subject to the fulfilment of certain criteria).	Noted

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Economy section (Policies AH1 and AH2) (continued)

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document

Issues raised
<p>Policy AH1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Must give the supplies of our food every encouragement; seems very general – how can it be enforced?; balances the needs of Marden as a working village; not sure why renewable energy is restricted to on-site use only; support in general but why put more stringent requirements on new farm buildings than on new residential buildings; countryside is being eaten up by housing developments; new buildings in the countryside should be coloured grey to reduce impact; should only happen if no derelict buildings on farms; RB1 and AH1 need to be considered together; farming also needs to be supported; farming community needs to be supported.</p>
<p>Policy AH2 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 support • 2 did not support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>It is necessary to have this as our local residents do not wish to do this work; essential for workers to pick the fruit but must be removed if not being used; suitable accommodation is required; seasonal workers needed by farms; balances the needs of Marden as a working village; temporary accommodation is essential for seasonal workers – failure to do so would place impossible demands of existing local accommodation during the picking season; will lead to caravans everywhere; standard of accommodation needs raising; many are not temporary – how can this be enforced?; will help the continuation of current agriculture to provide for a work force; businesses need workers and therefore accommodation is important.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section.**Policy A1 – Community Facilities****Policy OS1 – Open Space (renamed A2)****Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy OS1 – Delete the word “enhanced” in the supporting text to the policy (page 20, paragraph 3), which states the loss of open space will be resisted “unless enhanced replacement open spaces are guaranteed”. Reason: Does not conform to NPPF, which states that the loss of open space would be replaced by equivalent <u>or</u> better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.	“enhanced” deleted from supporting text.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy OS1 - Supporting text should refer to new open space being provided as part of the Parsonage Farm allocation (Local Plan policy OS1(8)).	Added to supporting text
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy OS 1 - The policy needs to define “large-scale development” and “suitable mechanisms”.	“large-scale developments” amended to “major developments” and defined in footnote. “suitable mechanisms” deleted.
Natural England	Policy A1 – we advise that this policy incorporates links to existing G/BI concepts during the development of new community facilities. Supporting the creation of G/BI is directly in line with the: NPPF (99 & 114), the Maidstone Local Plan (4.23 & 6.14) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted
Natural England	Policy OS1 – We strong support that this policy sets a positive and comprehensive precedent for ensuring developers are responsible for providing open space, which is in line with NPPF (73), the Maidstone Local Plan (6.86-6.93) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted
Natural England	Policy OS1 -We advise that this policy incorporates links for existing G/BI concepts when developing open spaces. Supporting the creation of G/BI is directly in line with the: NPPF (99 & 114), the Maidstone Local Plan (4.23 and 6.14) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section (Policies A1 and OS1) (continued)

Natural England	Policy OS1 -We advise that support should be given to developments which create and maintain open spaces with a high ecological value such as: wild flower meadows, amphibian friendly ponds or woodlands suitable for bats. This would count toward biodiversity net gain, in line with the NPPF (109 & 152). It would also serve to safeguard protected sites from the impact of increased recreational disturbance caused by development.	Noted
Historic England	Policy A1 – supports development in certain circumstances (ie subject to the fulfilment of certain criteria).	Noted

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document

Issues raised
<p>Policy A1 - Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Needs to be expanded to include provision for youth facilities; important to get funding for local facilities; local businesses should be supported; a vibrant and expanding local economy is essential to avoid becoming a dormitory suburb; having 3 different parking restrictions hardly encourages people to shop locally; sensible approach to maintain the heart of the parish; Marden does not need any more community centres; library needs support; community facilities are vital to the whole of Marden.</p>
<p>Policy OS1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Safeguarding open space is essential; people must appreciate and look after their surroundings; should include future management and maintenance of open space; facilities need to be provided that attract all age ranges; especially linkage to PROW network; need to ensure existing open spaces are not put under pressure due to increase of development; want to keep our rural history and agricultural heritage; open spaces need to be accessed by all.</p>

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment**Policy E1 – Primary Education (*renamed A3*)****Policy E2 – School Traffic (*deleted*)****Policy E3 – Nursery Care and Education (*deleted*)****Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Kent County Council	Supporting Text - In light of KCC's guidelines on pupil eligibility for school transport, KCC requests further clarification on the strongly worded statement raised within the MNP which states that there is a "wide range of secondary education within reach of Marden, although there are ongoing issues with Kent County Council's secondary school transport arrangements which are, at present, denying real choice for some of Marden's children" (p21). The MNP does not elaborate on what these issues are whether they are specific to Marden or whether they are related to KCC's home to school transport provision as a whole.	Wording amended to clearly spell out that children attending schools where the only access by public transport is by train do not benefit from subsidized travel arrangements
Kent County Council	Policy E2 (p22) – It should be noted that a new development can only be required to mitigate its own impact. This restricts KCC's ability to secure highways improvements that tackle pre-existing congestion or safety issues through the planning process, unless it can be demonstrated that the issues will be made worse by the new development.	Policy E2 deleted, see also MBC comments below. As it would be difficult to prove that the issues will be made worse by the new development. The supportive text has been strengthened to outline actions that have taken place to try to mitigate the issues.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy E1 - Supporting text (page 21, paragraph 2) states that the Local Plan lists education as a priority for residential, business and retail development. This statement does not fully reflect the provisions of Local Plan Policy ID1.	Noted – see below
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy E1 – The policy should be reworded. Reason: Development cannot ensure that the school has sufficient capacity and resources	Policy ID1 lists the infrastructure priorities. Education is one of the priorities, not the priority. MNP Policy E1 has been amended to reflect.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy E2 – The policy should be reworded. Reasons: As written the policy does not conform to NPPF tests for planning obligations	See above ref KCC comments
Historic England	Policy E1 – supports development in certain circumstances (ie subject to the fulfilment of certain criteria).	Noted

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment (Policies E1, E2 and E3) (continued)

Other consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Community Warden	I support this policy for the reasons stated in the plan. I also think the provision of an annexe on a separate site perhaps be considered as this would also address the increased traffic problem. It could also be somewhere that the Pre-School could relocate to. Perhaps an additional primary school with space for the Pre-School could be considered.	Supporting text has been amended ref Primary and Pre School capacity
Pre School Play Group	Background to MPSPG, capacity issues and desire to finding suitable facilities for more children and extended hours	Supporting text has been amended ref Primary and Pre School capacity

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document

Issues raised
<p>Policy E1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 support • 1 did not support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Is there sufficient capacity at the school?; Education is important – permanent buildings should be put in place; expansion of school should start now; ensure high standard of primary education is available to all in the village; limit new building; ensure that class sizes do not increase to the detriment of effective teaching and learning – have a great school and teachers work tirelessly; need extension rather than adding additional mobile classrooms; sad that Marden is having to make do rather than have a new school built; new school should incorporate provision of parking and drop-off/collection.</p>
<p>Policy E2 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 support • 1 did not support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Less traffic if parents were encouraged to walk to school; School parking an issue with parking on both sides of the road and on the bend; more development brings more parking issues.</p>
<p>Policy E3 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 support <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Local provision for early years is essential; support for parents and for Children's Centre; ensure a high standard of nursery care and education is available to all in the village; pre-school education is essential.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

**Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section.
Policy HC1 – Health Care (*renamed A4*)**

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	The Policy should be deleted or reworded. Reason: As written the policy does not conform with NPPF tests for planning obligations	Rewrite policy to confirm with NPPF
West Kent CCG	Contributions from developers will be necessary to ensure sustainable medical centre infrastructure to support the growth in population. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is effective from 1 October 2018 and therefore either strategic or non-strategic (ie parish) allocations will be the route for making the case for funding contributions.	Agreed

Marden Medical Centre – General Comments:

Since our statement in 2014 our list size has increased by approximately 630. We made the decision 2 years ago to retract our boundary to exclude most of Staplehurst as at this time we were encountering significant numbers of patients opting to register with us rather than in Staplehurst. This was partly to try to enable us to focus on maintaining a high standard of care for our existing patients but also to enable us to manage escalating demand. We implemented a strict registration policy (see attached document) which, although at times unpopular has proved essential.

The rise in patient numbers has perhaps been slower than anticipated but has none the less had a significant impact on all aspects of the Medical Centre's functioning. It takes time to get to know new patients and within the first year of a new registration consultation rates are higher. Our reception and administrative teams are dealing with a greater workload: each new registration brings with it an administrative burden as registration documents need to be processed and records tidied and summarised.

There is increased demand on appointments which we have tried to match with increased clinician availability (we now have a 2 salaried doctors, a paramedic practitioner and increased nurse and HCA hours). Despite this expectations remain high and patients not infrequently "grumble" that they can't get to see a doctor of their choice.

Within the last 6 weeks our list size has risen by over 50, largely due to the rapid influx of residents into the "social" housing on the Parsonage development. We are feeling a lot of pressure from this extra demand not just in terms of numbers but also from the higher incidence of health and social problems from the socio-economic cohort who are moving into these homes. They do not seem to be representative cross-section of a typical community. This was something we had not anticipated or planned for. Having liaised with Georgina Pennicott from MHS homes I understand that there are 21 more homes still to be occupied on the Parsonage.

The new patients we are seeing in these homes often have complex medical issues but in addition are isolated with no vehicular transport or links or support from family or friends nearby. There are inadequate additional health related, social and support services in the village to meet their needs. This does not seem to be something which Maidstone Borough Council has considered in the allocation of residents to a rural community.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Built Environment section (Policy HC1) (continued)

We are trying to work collaboratively with other providers of health and social care in the village including the Children's Centre, health visitors and midwifery services. I know that they are all feeling the additional strain.

As we offer additional appointment availability and expand the team we are acutely aware that room space is at a premium. We have sadly had to give notice to the osteopath and physiotherapist who were using rooms so as to prioritise clinical space. We are already "hot desking" and are looking at other innovative ways that we can maximise use of our existing space. During peak consulting times the car park is usually full with only limited parking available on the road adjacent to the surgery.

Historic England	supports development in certain circumstances (ie subject to the fulfilment of certain criteria).	Noted
-------------------------	---	-------

Other consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Community Warden	Support policy. Provision of an annexe on a separate site could perhaps also be considered	Consider another surgery/ annex if expansion of practice continues

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Should seek to secure the excellent provision provided by Marden Medical Centre – if expansion means the relationship between patient and doctor is compromised another surgery should be investigated; healthcare provision is essential; a wider range of services needs to be provided; encourage complimentary healthcare services; medical centre must be cherished; enhanced facilities will be necessary or practice area (boundary) will need to be further reduced; consider satellite medical facilities;</p>

Policy re-written following further consultation with Marden Medical Centre.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section.Policy T1 – Sustainable Travel (*renamed In2*)Policy T2 – Additional Traffic (*renamed In3*)Policy T3 – Station (*renamed In4*)Policy P1 – Parking (*deleted*)**Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy T1 – Replace “by cycle and to provide” with “by cycle and that provide”.	Agreed
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy T1 - Replace “and to link with any nearby public rights of way” to “and to facilitate links with any nearby public rights of way”.	Agreed
Maidstone Borough Council	Define what is meant by “permeable”. Reason: to provide clarity	Policy amended so that “be ‘permeable’” now reads “provide through routes for pedestrians and cyclists”.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy T3 – Clarify what is meant by “proposals to expand Marden Station”.	Policy amended so that “expand Marden Station “ now reads “enhance facilities at Marden Station, including any development required to meet increased demand,”.
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy P1 – Delete reference to the 2015 Local Plan in the supporting text.	Agreed
Maidstone Borough Council	Delete reference to “where planning permission is required for garage conversion replacement on-site parking should be provided”. Reason: This requirement is unreasonable and therefore not enforceable.	Policy has been reworded as follows: “MBC Local Plan 2017 policy DM23 should be applied when assessing the impact of development affecting existing off-street parking provision as well as on new developments.”
Maidstone Borough Council	In its current form, the MNP policy weakens policy DM23 of the adopted Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017, which sets out detailed parking standards for residential development.	See above
Kent County Council	Policy T1 – the reference to off-road and lightly trafficked routes appears to overlook the potential scope to make the busier main routes more suitable for use by pedestrians and cyclists, such as through the provision of a crossing or through widening a footway to facilitate shared use by cyclists. Such routes can often form the most direct and convenient means of accessing key facilities, whereas diverting users onto alternative routes may simply result in longer and less desirable journey times.	Policy amended by addition of the following text to the end of the first paragraph: “or through improvements for non-motorised users on busier existing routes”.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

**Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section
(Policies T1, T2, T3 and P1) (continued)**

Kent County Council	Policy T2 – encapsulates road access requirements, but could be expanded to refer to mitigation measures in instances where a severe traffic impact could otherwise occur.	Policy amended by addition of the following text: “or b) mitigation measures are provided to reduce traffic impacts on otherwise less suitable roads to an acceptable level”.
Kent County Council	Policy T3 – It should be noted that a proposal to create additional station car parking may, in isolation, conflict with the aims of policies T1 and T2.	Policy is already caveated by “providing the proposal accords with other policies in the Marden Neighbourhood Plan”.
Kent County Council	Policy P1 – could usefully refer to cycle as well as car parking.	Policy has been further reworded as follows: “MBC Local Plan 2017 policy DM23 should be applied when assessing the impact of development affecting existing off-street parking provision for <u>motor vehicles and cycles</u> as well as on new developments”.

Kent County Council – General Comments:

The MNP includes a description of how the parish has previously sought to take forward traffic calming proposals within the village (p.34). It refers to a traffic calming scheme in 2006 that secured funding from KCC, but which was eventually cancelled. KCC, as the local Highways Authority, wishes to reaffirm its willingness to work with the Parish to bring forward improvements that will benefit the community – Noted (and welcomed).

Kent County Council - comments from Lead Local Flood Authority: (New Policy In1)

(KCC as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority is responsible for both minerals and waste safeguarding in Kent. In this capacity, KCC must ensure that mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised by other forms of development and that the continued lawful operation of permitted waste management capacity of the County is not compromised by new development.

The Marden Parish area incorporates three minerals of economic importance, which are present within the Maidstone Minerals Safeguarding Area; the safeguarding minerals being: (a) sub-alluvial river terrace deposits; (b) river terrace deposits; and (c) limestone – Pauldina Limestone and Weald Clay Formation.

The County Council notes that MNP does not appear to make reference to mineral safeguarding and therefore it will be necessary to take this matter into consideration in the Plan

The mineral safeguarding constraints need to be recognised in the MNP to ensure that a full understanding of the wider planning constraints is reflected and to achieve compliance with the NPPF and the relevant policies set out in the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30.

It should be noted that all waste management facilities are also safeguarded and any proposed development within 250m of the safeguarding facilities should take into account Policy CSW16 “Safeguarding of Existing Waste Management Facilities” and the potential safeguarding exemption criteria as set out in Policy DM8.) – now refer to Policy In1.

KCC appreciates that consideration of flood risk, given its impact within the MNP area. It would be appropriate for the Plan to be more explicit as to the form of preferred surface water drainage systems that should be implemented within new development. KCC would recommend consideration of more detailed policy direction on the following:

Keeping surface water on the surface to promote visibility and provide for easier maintenance.

Natural watercourse connectivity – KCC encourages maintenance of the existing flow paths and drainage connectivity.

Existing ditches – KCC would encourage incorporating any existing natural features within the landscaping for development.

MNPSG response: All advice taken and incorporated into text and Policies.

(Southern Water – General Comments (New Policy In1)

Southern Water is the statutory wastewater undertaker in the Parish of Marden. With reference to the paragraphs headed “Water Supply and Sewerage” on pages 36-37 we are pleased to note the MNP’s recognition of Southern Water’s recent improvements to its infrastructure and would like to see the inclusion, under the Infrastructure section of the MNP, a policy for the provision of wastewater infrastructure.

Although there are no current plans, over the life of the MNP, it may be that Southern Water will need to provide new or improved infrastructure either to serve new development and/or to meet stricter environmental standards. It is important to have a policy provision in the MNP which seeks to ensure that the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to meet these requirements is facilitated.

One of the core planning principles contained in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to “proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs”. Also the National Planning Practice Guidance states that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development”.

Proposed amendment: *To ensure consistency with the NPPF and facilitate sustainable development, we provide an additional policy as follows: “New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community, subject to other policies in the plan”. – now refer to Policy In1.*

MNPSG Response: New Policy Written – See Policy In1 – Water Supply/Water Supply and Sewerage

Natural England	Policy T1 – We strongly support the commitment to maximising travel on foot and bicycle which will help reduce vehicular air pollution and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Which is in line with the NPPF’s commitment to reduce emissions (30, 36, 93 & 95) and its commitment to improve air quality (124).	Noted
Natural England	Policy T1 – We support ensuring larger sites are permeable and link to public rights of way which reduces vehicular air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions as mentioned above. This also increases the benefits people can gain from G/BI as which are detailed in the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Noted
Natural England	Policy T3 – We support the commitment to increasing the capacity of the train station it results in decreased car use which in turn reduces air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Which is in line with the NPPF’s commitment to reduce emissions (30, 35, 93 & 95) and its commitment to improve air quality (124).	Noted

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section (Policies T1, T2, T3 and P1) (continued)

Highways England – General Comments

Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.

Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), in this case, particularly the A21 and the M20. Having reviewed the Marden Neighbourhood Plan, we note that the intention is to reassess the Marden Neighbourhood Plan on a regular basis to give time for the village to assimilate the already permitted development (including sites allocated in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan) before any further development sites can realistically be considered. Having examined the Neighbourhood Plan, and on this basis, we are satisfied that the plan's policies will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13 para 10 and DCLG NPPF para 32). Accordingly, Highways England does not, at present, offer any comments on the Marden Neighbourhood Plan.

Other Consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
South Eastern	Policy T3 - We do not propose to formally respond on this consultation but we have no objections to the Plan and are pleased that it includes "in principle" support for any potential future station redevelopment or growth.	Noted
South Eastern	Policy T3 – the current station car park is constrained on all sides and would be difficult to expand but if any future residential or commercial development was made north of the station we believe it would be sensible to include additional station car parking as part of any scheme.	Noted – see response to MBC comment on Policy T3.
Community Warden	Policy P1 – I support this policy for the reasons stated in the plan. Developments should be encouraged to have a parking area at the front for use by general public, residents and their visitors (as well as providing adequate parking for residents of the development at their properties). This would start addressing the issue of inadequate parking space in the village as a whole. The idea of creating parking spaces all around the village should help along narrow roads where some of the houses are so old they do not appear to have any parking spaces such as Howland Road and Maidstone Road and would also help address the commuter parking problems.	Noted

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section (Policies T1, T2, T3 and P1) (continued)

Nu-Venture	Funding from any prospective developers for the 28-service (Maidstone/Marden direct) to operate every day, all day.	Not clear that this aspiration can be developed through planning process
Nu-Venture	Necessary infrastructure ie bus stops, shelters and yellow-box/clearway markings at existing and any new bus stops in the Parish.	Added as part of a specific further action required.
Nu-Venture	Funds also need to be secured to keep the trees from overhanging roads used by buses.	Not clear that this aspiration can be developed through planning process.
Nu-Venture	More ambitiously, a proper bus turnaround point in the village is badly needed.	Noted
Nu-Venture	Bus shelter opposite the station needs to be repaired/replaced.	Noted – removed further up Church Hill as part of the pedestrian crossing installation by Millwood/ Redrow developers.

The following is a summary of residents' comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Policy T1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 in support • 1 did not support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Often quicker to walk than get the car out; need to explain what “permeable” means; need more cycle routes, especially off-road; in everybody’s interest; too much traffic through village already; adverse impact on traffic congestion on Goudhurst Road on a daily basis; more support for footpaths – ongoing maintenance of PROWs; ‘maximise travel by foot and cycle’ how can this be achieved? - more delivery vehicles – large number of “weekend cyclists” on the roads; anything which reduces car journeys is to be encouraged; important that village remains open to walkers and cyclists.</p>
<p>Policy T2 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 in support • 1 did not support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Need more joined up thinking to treat roads and developments together; careful siting of developments is essential; far too much traffic already – traffic should be curtailed rather than additional; all developments will generate additional traffic; not all access roads are suitable; traffic in the village has increased greatly; all new development will generate additional traffic – both foot or vehicular.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy T3 – Responses with comments: 17 in support • 1 did not support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Station is crucial to the village but parking is a nightmare; vital to provide additional parking for commuters; more parking needed to keep parked cars off local roads; policy needs to be expanded to mention additional parking and step-free access to the “down” platform; what does “expand” mean?; railway is an essential service when buses so few; service is generally good but a lift would really improve station facilities; help reduce parking on residential roads.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section (Policies T1, T2, T3 and P1) (continued)

Policy P1 – Responses with comments:

- 19 in support
- 1 neither

Comments included:

Parking is a real problem and no garage conversions should be allowed unless appropriate parking is available; at least 2 off-road spaces per property should be provided; unnecessary parking on the roads rather than within properties is a menace to other road users; parking must be provided; traffic congestion in Goudhurst Road is a daily problem; on-road parking causes significant congestion and raises safety issues especially in the High Street and school areas – garage conversions will add to the congestion as will new developments with inadequate parking; parking must be adequate on all developments.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section**Policy H1 – Local Needs Housing (*renamed In5*)****Policy H2 – Housing for Older People (*renamed In6*)****Policy H3 – Housing for Gypsies and Travellers (*renamed In7*)****Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H1 – The policy and supporting text should clarify the difference between “affordable housing” (Local Plan strategic policy SP20), which meets a borough-wide need, and “affordable local needs housing on rural exception sites” (Local Plan policy DM13), which meets a specific local need for local people. The definitions contained in the consultation draft NPPF are helpful.	Policy reworded
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H1 - Amend supporting text reference (page 25, paragraph 2) from “100m ² ” to “1,000m ² (gross internal area” Reason: to reflect the provision of Local Plan policy SP20.	Amended supporting text
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H1 – The policy should be deleted or reworded. Reason: The policy does not conform to the NPPF or the strategic policies of the adopted Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017.	Policy reworded
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H2 – Delete reference to “or adjacent to”. Reason: The policy does not conform to the strategic policies of the adopted Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017 because countryside policies apply to development outside the defined boundaries of Local Plan settlements.	Policy reworded
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H2 - Further, page 38 of the MNP lists the policy as applying within the settlement boundary.	Amended
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H3 – The supporting text should include a reference to the Local Plan allocation at Oak Lodge (Local Plan policy GT1(9)).	Amended
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H3 - The definition for Gypsies and Travellers should be corrected to reflect that set out in the CLG publication “Planning policy for traveller sites” (August 2015).	Amended supporting text
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H3 - Delete reference in the policy to “outside the settlement area”. Reason: The policy is unduly restrictive because sites can be provided within settlement boundaries.	Deleted
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H3 – Reword policy regarding residential amenity. Reason: Development cannot <u>provide</u> adequate levels of residential amenity to adjacent neighbours.	Amended

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section (Policies H1, H2 and H3) (continued)

Maidstone Borough Council	Policy H3 – Clarify what is meant by “Additional support will be given to local gypsy families with a proven link to Marden”.	Last sentence deleted
Natural England	Policy H2 – We advise that this policy incorporates links to existing G/BI concepts during the development of new housing for older people. Supporting the creation of G/BI is directly in line with the NPPF (99 & 114), the Maidstone Local Plan (4.23 & 6.14) and the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Amended
Natural England	Policy H2 - We advise making natural areas more accessible to elderly population should be supported as it enables those who have mobility impairments to gain the health/well-being benefits of G/BI mentioned in the Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy (5.28-34).	Amended
Natural England	Policy H3 – We strong advise that this policy should specifically cite that settlements will not cause deleterious impacts on biodiversity. As minimising loss of biodiversity is an aim of the NPPF (109 & 152).	Amended
Historic England	Policy H2 & H3 – supports development in certain circumstances (ie subject to the fulfilment of certain criteria).	Noted

Other Consultees

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Community Warden	Policy H1 – I support this policy for the reasons stated in the plan. Those with family in the area would hopefully be more likely to support each other and the community which is of growing importance in this age of cutbacks and social isolation.	Noted

The following is a summary of residents’ comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document

Issues raised
<p>Policy H1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 support • 1 did not support • 1 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Local housing is essential to provide support for extended families; we will always need social housing; too many social housing units are being given to people from outside the area; important to maintain links to the community; to sustain a vibrant community; currently applicants do not have a proven connection to Marden; will go some way to addressing the problem of those working locally; how affordable is</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Infrastructure section (Policies H1, H2 and H3) (continued)

“affordable”; support for additional bungalow units; local people must come first; very important to manage and maintain generational connections.

Policy H2 – Responses with comments:

- 20 support
- 2 did not support
- 2 neither

Comments included:

Where can bungalows be built close to the village centre; no bungalows included in the new developments; need for such housing that does not incur an annual service charge; developments like Bramley Court will be needed more than ever; need to ensure housing is suitable for older people; elderly people are vulnerable and need help; would free up family houses; should include single storey, assisted living and full care; why should older people be forced into smaller properties?; how can “a vibrant and interesting view” be achieved?; community should have a mixture of age groups.

Policy H3 – Responses with comments:

- 15 support
- 3 did not support
- 1 neither

Comments included:

Already significant provision in the area; emphasis must be on “no impact on the countryside”; ensure that an adequate number of “official” sites is available to minimise the risk of harmful unauthorised encampments; historically Marden has links to the gypsy/traveller communities – a village is a better place if it is inclusive rather than exclusive; along with suitable drainage and other amenities; travellers from outside the Parish should be discouraged.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Economy section.**Policy ED1 – Business and Employment (*renamed E1*)****Policy R1 – Local Retail Centres (*renamed E2 – Retail – eat, meet and greet*)****Statutory consultees**

Consultee	Issue raised	Response
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy ED1 – The NPPF reference (page 30, paragraph 2) has been misquoted.	Amended
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy ED1 – Named reference to the two Local Plan allocate employment sites should be made in the supporting text.	Amended
Maidstone Borough Council	Policy R1 – Consider amending references to “local retail centre” to “district centre”, and “High Street local retail centre” to “High Street and Church Green district centre”. Reason: to provide clarify by aligning with Policy DM17 of the adopted Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2017.	Reworded
Kent County Council	Policy ED1 – the reference to business and employment needing to be “appropriately sited in terms of traffic movement” could be better phrased, such as instead stating “afforded suitable road access to and from primary routes, such as the A229.”	Reworded
Historic England	Policy ED1 – supports development in certain circumstances (ie subject to the fulfilment of certain criteria).	Noted

Other Consultees

The following is a summary of residents’ comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Policy ED1 – Responses with comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 support • 2 neither <p>Comments included:</p> <p>Must have business and employment to survive; important to provide local employment opportunities; Marden needs to be a living village, with industry; all development should be designed to provide landscaping; only if appropriately sited; positively supports Marden so that in future there is less chance that it will become a ghost/commuter village – a vibrant and expanding local economy is essential; support to encourage economic growth; “appropriately sited” are key words here; traffic through the village is a problem; good to have local employment; important prospect for the village to be a starting ground for small businesses; thriving commercial/industrial activity will stop the village from becoming a dormant suburb.</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback on Economy section (Policies ED1 and R1) (continued)

Policy R1 – Responses with comments:

- 20 support

Comments included:

Keeping the High Street a hub for shops and services is key to village life; also need to add the opening of new retail outlets to support local needs (eg clothing, florist, optician, places where people and meet, eat and drink); ever more necessary as the local population expands; residents who are able to shop locally save on petrol and lessening their negative impact on the environment; agree Church Green shops should be included as a retail centre; support needs to be strengthened to encourage new shops and services; need to keep a good range of shops; better one lorry delivering food than 10 individual vans; essential ingredient of village life.

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback – General Comments

Statutory consultees

Maidstone Borough Council	Action Taken / Noted
The front cover of the MNP should refer to the period for which the plan applies (eg 2018 to 2031).	Noted
Page 7, paragraph 3: Local Plans do not “supplement” the NPPF, rather they explain how national policies apply to the local level, in order to guide the decision making process for land uses and development proposals	Amended
Page 7, paragraph 4: typo “October”	Amended
Para 8, paragraph 1: The plan should make clear that the neighbourhood planning process includes an additional consultation stage (Regulation 16) between this Regulation 14 consultation and examination. Consultation is undertaken by the Borough Council and representations received are forwarded to the Examiner for consideration during examination.	Amended
Page 24, paragraph 4: The five Local Plan allocated housing sites, including dwelling yields, should be set out in the neighbourhood plan, cross-referencing to the Local Plan. Additional information on progress could be added to explain that 3 sites are under construction H1(43)/H1(44)/H1(45), one site has full planning permission H1(46) and the fifth site H1(47) has a submitted planning application that is awaiting decision.	Amended
Page 38, Policy H3: Should apply to the whole of the parish	Amended
Page 40, paragraph 1: Time to assimilate development before further development sites can be delivered is not a planning issue	Noted
Further Actions: Where Further Actions are required by bodies other than the Parish Council, these should be reworded to make clear that Marden Parish Council will engage with such bodies to seek the change/amendment.	Noted and reworded
Omission: Reference should be made in the MNP to the adopted minerals safeguarding areas including in the adopted Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-2030 (2016). These safeguarding areas are reproduced on the Maidstone Borough Local Plan Policies Map.	Noted and amended
<p><u>Planning Policies and Further Actions Map</u></p> <p>It would be helpful to cross-reference FAs to specific policies.</p> <p>OS(7) should be OS1(8)</p> <p>The boundary for R1 is incorrect and should be labelled a District Centre.</p>	Noted and amended
Kent County Council	Action Taken / Noted
Further guidance on mineral safeguarding and minerals assessments can be found in KCC’s safeguarding supplementary planning document a the following link: https://www.kent.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0019/69310/supplementary-planning-document-spd-on-minerals-and-waste-safeguarding.pdf	Noted
KCC looks forward to working with the Parish Council on the formulation and delivery of the MNP and welcomes further engagement as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses.	Noted with thanks

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback – General Comments (continued)

Other consultees

Staplehurst Parish Council	Action Taken / Noted
Parish Council commented that the document covered some interesting policy areas but differed from the Staplehurst plan in that it was not specific about land use and contained just one map. The comment re land use arose from SPC's experience of dealing with Maidstone Borough Council when they developed their plan. MBC were insistent that their policies should all relate to use of land which in turn should be clearly red-lined. Anything that wasn't land-related was deemed an "objective" rather than a policy. SPC wished to be engaged with the MNP Steering Group at future stages.	Noted
Paddock Wood Town Council	Action Taken / Noted
Support the plan	Noted
Horsmonden Parish Council	Action Taken / Noted
Horsmonden PC note Marden's Neighbourhood Plan with interest.	Noted
Marden Youth Club	Action Taken / Noted
Marden is home to a weekly Youth Club offered by Infozone Maidstone and run out of the John Banks Hall. Established over ten years ago, this club offers a safe space for youth people ages 11 to 19 to learn, play and socialise with peers. Additionally, the Youth Club mobilises to address the local concerns affecting the young people of Marden. Some of these concerns include: access to sexual health information, drug use, lack of awareness around healthy lifestyles, lack of/no involvement in school or employment, gang involvement and risk of child sexual exploitation. Despite limitations of storage, staffing and the challenging behaviours of youth people the club manages to engage a range of 20 to 30 young people per session. The Kent County Council demographic baseline for individuals ages zero to 19 indicates that almost 60% of young people in Marden fall within the eight 19 range. This evidences a strong case for the existence of youth services within the parish. Within this range the Youth Club supports young people from a variety of socio-economic and cultural backgrounds including Gypsy/ Traveller and social housing occupants. Marden has an established pre-school group, primary school and children's centre that supports the positive development of children from zero to 7 but the Youth Club is the only free, non-denominational support option for older young people in the area. Given that all secondary school options for young people exist just outside of Marden, having the Youth Club within the parish is vital for making young people feel supported within their community once they age out of children's services.	Noted and incorporated into Amenities : Community Facilities Section

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback – General Comments (continued)

Marden Pre-School	Action Taken / Noted
<p>Marden Pre-School has successfully served the community of Marden since 1967, we have close links with Marden Primary School and the Children’s Centre. We currently offer Pre-School education for children aged 2-5 years old during term time. In recent months we have been overwhelmed with enquiries for the uptake of funded and non-funded places. We have found ourselves in the position, for the first time in many years, advising families that we are unable to offer their child/ren a place from September 2018.</p> <p>Whilst we occupy a large space within the Memorial Hall, the flexibility of this, as the ages and stages of children change, is becoming less flexible. As the village grows the enquiries for extended hours and full-time day care has also become more of a priority for our existing families and those moving into the ever-expanding village. We are currently only able to open for 24 hours per week 38 weeks per year. Staff set up and pack away at the beginning and end of each session. Marden and surrounding villages would benefit from us being able to offer 50 hours per week, 50 weeks per year.</p> <p>Marden Pre-School still remain committed to finding suitable facilities to enable the families of Marden and surrounding villages to access both Pre-School and Full day care. We would very much welcome support and assistance from our Parish Council and villagers to enable this vision to become a reality.</p>	<p>Noted and incorporated into Amenities : Education Section and Policy E2</p>

The following is a summary of residents’ comments. All were viewed, taken on board and, where relevant, incorporated into the document.

Issues raised
<p>Broadly I think that the Plan the Steering Group has provided is to be commended, with the Natural Environment chapter being particularly strong. I do however have a huge doubt about the weight that Maidstone Borough Council will attach to any Neighbourhood Plan - I would give the example of Staplehurst as a case in point, but also nationally there does appear to be an issue with Local Planning Authorities having to balance the competing demands of mandated housing numbers from central Government, highly proactive developers, and under-resourced and pressurised local planning authorities. However, I commend you for trying. In addition I think you might wish to consider a much shorter public version maybe 2-4 pages, which might be a more accessible read The Index (Page 2) could do with being a bit more detail - for example “Built Environment” does not mean much to the majority of people.</p>
<p>Elements in the 'Spatial Application of Policies' (page 38) - for example the sub-headings, might be better assimilated into the main Index If you are going to have a fold-out map I might consider including a map with services and indicative flood plain within the key.</p>
<p>Housing land allocations: It is of regret that the Plan has no policy with the housing section on housing site allocation, other than for specific categories (older people etc) or for farm building conversion. There is nothing really to guide spatial planning. Under 'Further actions required' (page 27) the plan needs to be more assertive than just say that Marden Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will '<i>monitor progress</i>' of Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan allocations for major housing developments. This is the 'elephant in the room' of this plan</p>

APPENDIX 3 Continued

Marden Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation feedback – General Comments (continued)

Retail centres & parking: Under 'Further action required' (page 33) - it might be prudent to include a reference to the parking issues in the vicinity of the retail facilities at the Church Green/Pattenden Lane junction. I feel that, coupled with the issue of Marden station and the associated parking issues, this is a significant parking issue - and both needs to be cross-referenced in the 'Parking' section (page 36)

'The Future' chapter (page 39-40) also contains issues that relate to housing and planning. This might be confusing to the reader I would suggest that to help with the flow of the text, you consider moving the section 'Developer Contributions' and moving (or copying the essence of) the section 'What does the future hold for Marden', and include both in the 'Housing' section (pages 23-28). The 'Future' would then solely discuss the next interaction of the Neighbourhood Plan.

I agree with most things that you state in the plan, but there is nothing in the plan about improving quality of life for residents that have been impacted by continual development, both residential and commercial. Living in Howland Road we desperately need to reduce traffic volumes. Our cars and houses are getting damaged, and health matters are not improved by the NOX release from diesel engines. You refer in your plan to looking after historical buildings, yet some of our houses in Howland Road are exactly that. I cannot understand why large commercial vehicles are not banned from Marden other than to/from Pattenden Lane. Large vehicles are not allowed through Yalding so why here? I think otherwise the Plan is excellent and will bring benefits to all residents of Marden PC.

Congratulations to all the people who have spent hours putting this plan together

Marden Parish Council Village Plan Landscaping I note from the Neighbourhood plan that there will be an open space between the Redrow and Millwood developments. Who will be responsible for maintaining this area? The stream that runs to the North of the developments is often full of rubbish and is an eyesore, particularly the pond by the playing field. Who is responsible for the stream and the ponds? A clear maintenance plan is required both for the amenity and for flood prevention. With the developments there will be increased runoff and the stream must be kept clear to improve drainage and reduce the risk of flooding.

APPENDIX 4

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

APPENDIX 4**Reference documents**

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Hedgerow Regulations 1997

Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Soil: the Soil Code; Revised 1998

Marden Design Statement 2001

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

The Kent Design Guide 2005

The Kent Design Guide 2005: Design for Crime Prevention Undated

The Kent Design Guide 2005: Kent Climate Challenge, Planning & Designing for Sustainable Energy Use 2009

Landscape Convention 2006

Marden Community Action Plan 2006

Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006

DCLG Manual for Streets 2007

Climate Change Act 2008

Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking 2008

Record of Historic Street Furniture, the Marden Society 2009

EU Biodiversity Strategy 2011

Localism Act 2011

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

The Neighbourhood Planning (Referendums) Regulations 2012

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

EU Regulation 1143/2014: Prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species

APPENDIX 4 Continued

Maidstone Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy 2016

National Planning Policy Guidance 2016

Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017

Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan 2017

Maidstone Borough Council Local Plan Evidence Base 2017

Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017

National Planning Policy Framework 2018

National Planning Policy Guidance 2018

KCC Rights of Way Improvements Plan Consultation Draft 2018

Planning Advice for Integrated Water Management University of Cambridge Institute for Sustainability Leadership Undated

Kent Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4

Marden Parish Council Planning Policies:

Planning Policy No 1: Guidance for Committee Members and Public

Planning Policy No 2: Enforcement

Planning Policy No 3: Development (S106) Contributions

Planning Policy No 4: Gypsy Sites