Mr Robert Mellor Local Plan Inspector c/o Programme Officer PO Services PO Box 10965 Sudbury Suffolk CO103BT

Our Ref: 16-015 Your Ref: 19109

Dear Mr Mellor

Maidstone Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation Sutton Street, Bearsted, Maidstone- Proposed Urban Boundary

Representation 19109

We are acting on behalf of two property owners on Sutton Street (Mr J Bentley and Mr P Slaughter) in connection with the above.

This representation relates to the existing and proposed urban boundaries to the eastern side of Bearsted. We have not used the Questionnaire proforma forwarded by the Programme Officer as that document relates to specific sites.

Sutton Street is currently located within the countryside in the emerging local plan. The site <u>is not</u> situated within a Conservation Area an AONB. The area is not within an Area of Local Landscape Value (ALLV).

There is no neighbourhood plan covering Sutton Street.

As previously stated to the west of Sutton Street is the site referenced as Cross Keys (Policy H1 (32) allocated for 50 dwellings. There is already a planning permission in place for this development (MA/14/504795). All Section 106 agreement have been completed and planning permission has been granted.

This allocated site has effectively removed the open space that has separated Sutton Street from the village boundary of Bearsted as shown in the Maidstone Borough Wide Local Plan adopted in 2000. In allowing planning permission and including the site in the local plan the local planning authority has effectively linked Sutton Street with the village envelope of Bearsted. It is no longer a separate linear settlement. This is a 'de facto' situation although it is not reflected in the current village boundary lines shown in the emerging local plan.

To the north of Roundwell and Sutton Street there is a separate allocation for 122 dwellings at Barty Farm (Policy H1 (21). Once again existing properties on the north side of Roundwell have been specifically excluded from inclusion within the Bearsted village.

We therefore respectfully request the local planning authority and the Inspector appointed to examine the Maidstone local Plan revisit the boundaries shown in current draft document in relation to Sutton Street and Roundwell.

Although sites on the edges of the urban area, rural service centres and larger villages have been proposed in the emerging Maidstone Local Plan there has been no work on revising and rationalising the former boundaries to reflect these changes.

At a meeting of the Maidstone Cabinet on 18 April 2016 prior to the Regulation 19 Maidstone Local Plan submission it was agreed by Councillors and the Head of Planning that there would be no boundary review undertaken prior to the Inquiry (if at all). No reasoning was given at the meeting as too why that decision was taken.

Existing residents on Sutton Street are asking for parity and equal status with the neighbouring properties that will soon be developed to the west and north in this area. At present, the draft plan depicts properties on Sutton Street will be in open countryside. Sutton Street will no longer be isolated or remote from Bearsted but integral and linked to the urban area of Maidstone and Bearsted.

We have attached a plan with a proposed boundary line depicting the inclusion of Sutton Street so that it will form part of Bearsted. This new boundary line includes all properties on Sutton Street and their respective gardens and land.

In summary, the Maidstone Local Plan should be positively prepared. At present, the boundary lines shown which remain unchanged cannot be justified. In short, they are manifestly unfair and remain tightly drawn following a policy of restraint that has been in existence for over 40 years throughout Kent.

Sutton Street is a sustainable location and is well placed to access services in Bearsted and Maidstone. Inclusion of Sutton Street in the urban area would be consistent with national nalicy which is to promote and deliver systeinable d

consistent with	national policy which is to promote and deliver sustainable
development.	It should therefore be included as part of the urban area of Bearste
in light of these	e surrounding draft allocations that surround the area.
Yours Sincerel	v

Andrew Street

Enc