

Task 3

This task tested how the plan area could accommodate any new housing development. Many different sites were highlighted as areas that should not be developed but this task focuses on areas suitable for housing development so this shall be the information discussed.

Brenchley responses Task 3a

- Gedges Hill to the North of Matfield along Maidstone Road (B2160) was recommended by some groups. This is due to it being in proximity to Paddock Wood and rail links.

Matfield responses Task 3a

- One group was largely unsupportive of any development in surrounding Matfield but suggested one site to East of Oakfield Road within the village.
- Suggested site to the south of Chestnut Lane but not to the north. Suggested land to the east of the allotments but not north of it. Suggested field to east of Webbs Orchard but not too far out beyond or disrupting woodland. Field off Pralls Lane.
- Land all the way along north and south of Brenchley Road, Brenchley as possibly suitable for development but not by Brenchley Club or south of the village. To the east of the village two sites are suggested to the north of Broad Oak and north-east of Broad Oak Close but not east of Broad Oak.
- Suggested creating a new village at Tibbs Farm utilizing redundant farm buildings or at Kipings Cross to utilize road network of a larger scale was seen as more realistic.

Brenchley responses Task 3b

- Site 410 was unanimously opposed by all groups as it is considered to be too large and one group stating there is an inappropriate access. Site 215 and 393 were similarly thought to be inappropriate with the majority of groups opposing it. Again, infrastructure was felt to be sufficient for site 215. Site 34 and 80 again was opposed by the majority of groups stating in particular at site 80 that the open countryside should be protected.
- Site 103 split the groups however most felt it was too large if the area was to be built on. Sites 214 and 427 also split groups however the majority felt that they should be built on. Site 383 was also split however the majority were opposed with comments siting that the site is too big and would detrimentally impact on the nice countryside and further would need road improvements to make it suitable.
- Sites 36 and 414 in the village of Matfield were supported by groups with no oppositions. With another group suggesting to the north of site 412 should be considered. A rolling theme was the concern of the infrastructure needed first particularly to the north of Matfield along the B2160.

Matfield responses Task 3b

- In the heart of Matfield site 410 was unsupported by a majority with most groups specifically siting that the site is simply too large for the village. Site 242 was unanimously unsupported with no particular reason given. Site 34 and 36 were largely unsupported by local residents with one group raising particular concerns about the potential impact on local woods.
- Sites 214, 326, 353, 414 and 401 had the most support by residents however none of these sites were unanimously so. Site 401 had the most support with groups stating it was a good location however others stating that there were too many potential homes in this area. Site 18 also gained a lot of support however the majority voted against this site due to the potential impact on the woods. Other groups suggested creating new hamlet to Kippings Cross as opposed to expanding the existing villages.

Summary

In summary most participants were supportive and understanding of the need to provide housing somewhere within the local area although there was no particular consensus as to where that should be. This provided that appropriate infrastructure was put in place to accommodate it. Most identified that a large housing allocation such as the proposal at site 410 was not considered to be appropriate for the villages.