
Mr Philip Coyne
Interim Strategic Director – Local Plan Review
Maidstone Borough Council

Our Ref: PINS/U2235/429/10

Date: 11 January 2023

Dear Mr Coyne

Examination of the Maidstone Local Plan Review

1. Introduction

- 1.1 As discussed on the final day of the Stage 1 hearings on 25 November 2022, I am writing to provide an initial assessment regarding some matters of legal compliance and the over-arching soundness of the submitted spatial strategy. This includes, amongst other things, the housing requirement, the proposals for two large scale developments along garden community principles at Lenham Heathlands and Lidsing, and other strategic locations namely the Invicta Barracks in Maidstone and the Leeds-Langley Corridor. I have also set out some initial advice regarding housing land supply.
- 1.2 I must stress that the various soundness issues I have addressed in this letter are not exhaustive but are the key matters where I need to provide direction at this stage of the examination following the lengthy Stage 1 hearings. I am mindful that there is ongoing work principally in relation to transport and separately with the Habitats Regulation Assessment which may well require further proposed main modifications to the Plan. This correspondence is necessarily initial in its nature and the full explanation of my findings on plan soundness will be set out in my final report in due course. This final report will also deal with the various sites and policies to be examined in Stage 2 hearings which I would like to progress to, as soon as is practicable.

2. Fundamentals

Duty to Cooperate

- 2.1 Having considered the evidence, including oral submissions on Day 1 of the hearings and the additional material provided by the Council in September 2022 in documents ED39-42 and the further responses received in October 2022, I am satisfied that the Duty to Cooperate during the preparation of the Local Plan Review prior to submission has been met. My full reasoning on this matter will be set out separately in my final report. Consequently, the examination of the Plan going forward will focus on plan soundness.

Plan Period

- 2.2 The Plan was submitted in March 2022 with an anticipation of plan adoption by the end of 2022. That has not happened and so the plan period needs to be extended to at least 2037/8 to ensure a minimum 15 year plan period upon plan adoption for the strategic policies contained in the Plan in accordance with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This assumes plan adoption later in 2023. The start date of the plan period will also need to be adjusted. My recommendation is 1 April 2021, which would align with much of the evidence base and would recognise the plan was submitted for examination before 1 April 2022. It would also enable an initial year's worth of data on housing delivery in 2021/22 to be accounted for.
- 2.3 Also for consistency with national policy at paragraph 22 of the NPPF the submitted Plan needs to be clearer regarding growth locations that will deliver beyond the end of the plan period. I am satisfied that a proportional evidence base has been prepared in this regard, including extended transport modelling to 2050. Accordingly, proposed main modifications are required to the overarching Vision for Heathlands for consistency with national policy. The Council has prepared this in ED60 and I will be recommending it as a proposed main modification.

Plan Content

- 2.4 The Plan needs to be clearer on those 2017 Local Plan policies that would be superseded by the Local Plan Review and any residual 2017 Local Plan allocation policies that would remain 'saved'. This should include inserting the table in document ED9 as an appendix to the Plan by way of a proposed main modification. The Stage 2 hearings will consider this further on matters of detail, including the proposed approach to 2017 Local Plan gypsy and traveller site allocations.

3. Housing and Employment Land Requirements***Housing Need and requirement***

- 3.1 In the run-up to plan submission, the Borough's housing need, based on the Government's standard methodology was 1,157 dwellings per annum (dpa). This represents a significant increase of some 31% on the full objectively assessed housing need of 883dpa in the 2017 Local Plan. On the 23 March 2022 (8 days before the Local Plan Review document was submitted for examination) the latest median workplace-based affordability ratios were published¹. This would result in a revised housing need of 1,194dpa. As a starting point, the Council has positively sought to plan for significantly higher housing numbers by accommodating the full 1,157dpa, having regard to constraints such as Green Belt, areas of high flood risk, infrastructure capacity and landscape quality. Given the timing of the updated affordability ratio, it would be unreasonable to adjust the housing figures on the basis of an

¹ Resulting in an uplift in the affordability ratio for Maidstone from 10.0 (38%) to 10.85 (43%).

update to part of the formula on the very cusp of plan submission. I therefore find the calculation of local housing need as set out in the 2021 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) update to be soundly based.

- 3.2 No adjustments are required to the local housing need figure of 1,157dpa in terms of deriving the housing requirement. Again, I will set out the full reasoning for this in my final report. Taking the local housing need figure of 1,157dpa over the extended plan period would increase the overall housing requirement from 17,746 to 19,669. This requirement would need to be expressed as a minimum (i.e. 'at least') and will require proposed main modifications to Policy LPRSS1.

Employment Land Requirement

- 3.4 The submitted plan is underpinned by comprehensive Economic Development Needs Studies which have looked at scenarios of labour demand (Experian), past trends in completions and estimates of local labour supply based on demographic modelling in the SHMA update. A further Economic Development Needs Study (EDNS) Addendum in 2021 has looked at recent changes to the Use Classes Order, impacts of Brexit and Covid and applied latest Experian projections for 'labour demand' to cover the time period to 2042. The Council has selected the 'labour demand' scenario and my final report will explain why this would be appropriate, would not constrain the economic potential of the Borough and is therefore sound. The resulting requirement is expressed in Policy LPRSS1 as gross floorspace figures. Given the extended plan period above, it will be necessary for soundness to extrapolate the employment land (floorspace) requirement as a proposed main modification and the updated EDNS to 2042 would provide a sound basis for doing so.

4. The Spatial Strategy

- 4.1 One of the key tests for the submitted spatial strategy is that it is **an** appropriate strategy for securing a sustainable pattern of development in the Borough. In contrast to previous tests of soundness, it does not need to be demonstrably **the most** appropriate strategy. That said, in order to be an appropriate strategy, it needs to perform well against Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives² when compared against other reasonable options and so result in 'sustainable development' in a Maidstone Borough context. It also needs to be justified, effective (i.e. deliverable) and positively prepared.
- 4.2 The submitted plan is predicated on a bold strategy which includes two new large-scale developments to be delivered along the garden community principles in the north of the Borough. It also represents a move away from the previous 2017 Local Plan strategy of dispersing an appreciable proportion of growth to rural service centres and larger villages across the Borough. It remains that approximately 60% of the planned housing growth³ and 37% of

² Including the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

³ 51% in Maidstone and 9% on the Invicta Barracks strategic site (excluding windfalls).

the planned employment growth over the plan period would still take place within the Maidstone Urban Area. The Local Plan Review would also continue to support some dispersal of growth to appropriate settlements in the rural areas including key service centres in the south of the Borough.

- 4.3 The submitted Plan seeks to respond to the significant uplift in housing growth through larger scale developments. In principle there are cogent reasons why this would secure a sustainable pattern of development in Maidstone Borough consistent with paragraph 73 of the NPPF. This includes, amongst other things, the ability to: (i) comprehensively and positively create new places from the outset to secure longer term benefits that would be difficult to secure through incremental and individual smaller scale developments; (ii) significantly capturing the uplift in land values to fund and put in place necessary infrastructure in a logical and timely way to support new and existing communities, including significant levels of affordable housing; and (iii) protect large parts of the rural Borough and those sensitive fringes of Maidstone from additional, ad-hoc development.
- 4.4 My final report will set out in more detail why I consider the submitted spatial strategy has been appropriately selected through a clear audit trail presented in the earlier Regulation 18 consultations, the Stantec reports, the comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and substantial volumes of technical evidence. Matters are finely balanced between the reasonable spatial strategy options that were available to the Council, but the judgments applied by the Council in selecting the submitted spatial strategy have been reasonable. At this initial stage of the examination, whilst there are soundness issues with individual components of the strategy, the fundamental building blocks in Policy LPRSS1 for securing a sustainable pattern of development, including the settlement hierarchy, can be found sound as comprising an appropriate strategy. Consequently, I have no need to revisit the principle of the submitted spatial strategy in the Stage 2 hearings.
- 4.5 In terms of demonstrating the soundness of the submitted strategy, I have considered the submissions in respect of whether potential variants of the submitted strategy should have been appropriately tested through SA, namely a greater role for Invicta Barracks site and/or the Leeds-Langley Corridor. From everything I have read and heard I am satisfied that the Council, working with the relevant parties, has undertaken a proportionate approach to testing the potential of these locations, particularly the 1,300 homes at the Invicta Barracks site, which occupies a highly sustainable location in Maidstone town. I return to the Invicta Barracks site below in more detail, but I do not consider that there would be a reasonable alternative option for a spatial strategy that included a significantly higher capacity on the site, owing to, amongst other things, substantial harm to heritage assets and those parts of the site comprising an attractive veteran treed landscape.
- 4.6 Policy LPRSS1 identifies the Leeds-Langley Corridor as a potential strategic development location. Whilst the submitted Plan makes no positive allocation

in the area, it clearly establishes an expectation of development in this part of the Borough, akin to a 'broad location' as per NPPF paragraph 68b), potentially binding future plan-making. In considering locations for broad locations and large-scale developments, initial work has already been done in testing option RA4 ('Eastern Orbital Road Corridor Focus') in earlier iterations of SA in 2020, which showed that the option performed relatively poorly against SA objectives compared to other options.

- 4.7 Whilst there has been some progress in coordinating various land ownerships, including an updated position statement⁴, there remains considerable uncertainty in support of the proposed 'safeguarding' approach at Leeds-Langley to fund delivery of what is currently an estimated £57million local relief road. I appreciate the 2017 Local Plan anticipated matters to have been progressed on Leeds Langley Corridor by the time of this plan review but the Council was not beholden to this, particularly in light of the change in circumstances with the significant uplift in housing need. Whilst the Council has undertaken further high-level technical work in support of Leeds Langley⁵, it remains that plan preparation has considered options for developable sites / locations in accordance with NPPF paragraph 68 that better reflect the particular circumstances in Maidstone, as demonstrated through the Stantec Garden Communities studies [LPR2.51 & 2.52] and SA work. It is not necessary for plan soundness that additional longer-term development potential is identified at Leeds-Langley Corridor as part of this Plan. I deal with the detail of the Leeds-Langley Corridor in respect of submitted Policy LPRSP5(a) below, but my reservations are such that I am recommending the policy is neither justified nor effective. That would also mean deleting references to Leeds Langley in Policy LPRSS1 as part of the proposed main modifications for the spatial strategy policy.
- 4.8 I therefore conclude Policy LPRSS1 as submitted is not sound. The following main modifications, most of which have been presented in ED61, would be necessary for soundness:
- Proposed modifications to extend the plan period from 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2038
 - Proposed modification to increase the housing requirement from 17,746 to 19,669 and an allied modification to proportionally increase the employment floorspace requirement over the same period.
 - Remove Leeds Langley from part 7 of the submitted policy as a potential development location.

⁴ Document ED52

⁵ LPR1.76, LPR1.77 and ED24

5. Strategic Development Locations (Policies LPRSP4 and SP5)

Lenham Heathlands (Policy LPRSP4(a))

- 5.1 As set out above I consider in broad terms that the Plan's spatial strategy is justified, at a strategic level, in identifying Lenham Heathlands as a location for a new large-scale garden community development. Policy LPRSP4(a) sets out a detailed strategic policy comprising a comprehensive set of requirements for the site which in turn would be followed-up by a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and masterplanning process, in accordance with the government's garden community principles, prior to any initial planning application.
- 5.2 Development of the site will not be straightforward. There are issues of water quality, the sequencing of minerals operations on various parts of the site and impact on the setting of the nearby Kent Downs AONB together with the host landscape character within which the site is situated. There is, however, sufficient evidence at this stage to demonstrate a reasonable prospect that water quality issues can be mitigated to avoid harm to downstream protected habitats within the Stour catchment. The latest evidence on the timing and cessation of minerals operations is compatible with initial evidence on the phasing of the development and likely build-out rates.
- 5.3 The development will in its early stages result in notable landscape and visual harm, including views out from and towards the Downs scarp slope. Initial phases of the development would be conspicuous from within the AONB in expansive, panoramic views over the undulating Weald, including from short sections of the North Downs Way National Trail around and close to the Lenham Cross. The AONB is an environmental asset which the NPPF at paragraph 176 confirms has the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The final part of paragraph 176 states that development within the setting of AONBs should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts.
- 5.4 Whilst the Kent Downs AONB Unit remains concerned with the proposed allocation, various proposed modifications to the policy have been progressed with the Council and presented in updated Statements of Common Ground [ED64 & 67]. Having heard the various submissions and visited the various suggested viewpoints, I find the submitted policy would not be sound in providing a sufficiently robust and effective framework for mitigating the harm to the setting of the AONB and the local host landscape more generally. The proposed modifications in ED67 would significantly strengthen the requirements to strategically and comprehensively landscape the development, including along its sensitive northern edge. I consider they would be necessary for soundness and should comprise part of the schedule of proposed main modifications to Policy LPRSP4(a), updating and replacing relevant text previously presented in document LPRSUB011.

- 5.5 Lenham Heathlands remains subject to further work with Natural England on agreeing a strategy for mitigation in relation to nutrient neutrality and the downstream internationally protected habitat at the Stodmarsh Ramsar, SPA and SAC site. At this stage the evidence in the HRA addendum [LPRSUB005], the Natural England correspondence and nutrient mitigation analysis memo [ED35 & 36] and statements of common ground with Natural England (ED69) indicates a reasonable prospect of a deliverable solution through Natural England's updated 2022 land budget formula regarding farmland inputs, a new private waste water treatment works discharging into a significant wetland habitats area prior to any residual filtered flow entering into the Stour. Consequently, I am happy to proceed to Stage 2 hearings, but I am mindful that finalisation of the HRA work may require further modification to the policy and related discussion if required.
- 5.6 My final report will address in more detail those concerns regarding water quality more generally in the River Great Stour as a consequence of the proposed development, particularly for local fishery businesses. At this stage I will comment that securing a positive outcome on appropriate assessment as part of the HRA process will be predicated on demonstrating at a strategic level that water discharges from Lenham Heathlands into the Stour catchment will not exacerbate nitrogen and phosphate levels. Proposed wetland habitats will be an intrinsic part of the allocation and they would be fed by water discharged and treated to a necessarily high standard from a new private treatment plant. The wetlands would not be supplied from water from the Stour. As discussed at the hearings, the geology at the site of the proposed wetlands is mixed including some areas of clay and other areas of permeable sand. I am concerned about the permeable ground conditions given the sensitivity of the Stour water environment. The proposed solutions at Lenham Heathlands are intricate and whilst the Council has already provided a good amount of information on this, I am requesting that the Council prepares an additional brief paper on the delivery and timing of the proposed water treatment works and wetlands habitat along the lines explained at Day 6 of the hearings. This is likely to lead me recommending that some additional specificity to part 5(d) in Policy LPRSP4(a) would be necessary for soundness to recognise that elements of the proposed wetlands are likely to require specific design and implementation in relation to ground conditions to ensure that adjacent sensitive watercourses are appropriately protected.
- 5.7 In planning for larger scale developments the NPPF states that they should be of a size and location to support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment) or in larger towns to which there is good access. As submitted, the policy would not be sound in this regard and not in accordance with the basis on which the allocation was assessed in SA. Accordingly, main modifications would be necessary to ensure that infrastructure is delivered and coordinated in a timely manner. This is set out in LPRSUB011 and I recommend the proposed

insertion of a table within the policy setting out the phasing and related indicative infrastructure requirements.

- 5.8 In terms of securing genuine transport choices, a significant advantage of the Heathlands location compared to other spatial choices for large scale development is its location on the Ashford to Maidstone railway line and the potential for a new station to serve the allocation. SA was undertaken on this basis. Accordingly, I consider it necessary that a proposed main modification as presented in ED59 would be necessary for soundness. Additionally, the phasing table will need to be amended to identify the early delivery of a train station at Heathlands in phase 1 at a location that will form a hub within the allocation. Initial work⁶ demonstrates at a high-level that a station is potentially feasible from locational, operational and timetabling perspectives. Network Rail have supported, without prejudice, the submission of a strategic outline business case (SOBC)⁷. For the purpose of a strategic policy and demonstration of a reasonable prospect that an additional station at Lenham Heathlands is a realistic option, I consider the evidential threshold has been met and that a SOBC is not necessary at this stage for plan soundness.
- 5.9 Notwithstanding improved bus services, the potential of a new station and the requirement in Policy LPRSP4(a) to appropriately phase the delivery of infrastructure, services and jobs, the reality is, however, that future inhabitants will travel, and the private car will remain a key transport choice. Further work is ongoing regarding necessary off-site highway interventions. I stress however, that the work and outputs need only be proportionate to plan-making and not the level of detail necessary to inform a planning application (i.e. a detailed Transport Assessment). In headline terms the additional work needs to confirm a reasonable prospect of a deliverable solution to junction improvements at M20 Junction 8 and a headline menu of works along the A20 corridor which can be demonstrably necessary to facilitate the development. The outcomes of this work should be identified in an updated statement of common ground with National Highways and Kent County Council. At this stage I am satisfied, however, that the proposed modifications to parts 6e) and 6f) of the Policy LPRSP4(a), presented in ED59, provide sufficient policy hooks to ensure that any impacts on the strategic and local road networks are appropriately considered and where necessary mitigated.
- 5.10 Delivery at Lenham Heathlands will in large part be a consequence of Homes England's involvement as master-developer and their commitment to bring the scheme to fruition, including their distinctive ability to take a longer-term perspective on investment and returns. The housing trajectory assumes initial units being completed at Lenham Heathlands in 2030. Allowing for an SPD, masterplan and initial planning application that feels slightly optimistic given that plan adoption has moved back since the Heathlands Project Delivery Plan [LPR1.92] was prepared. Consequently, I recommend that first

⁶ ED14 – Outline Assessment of Case for a Station at Heathlands – JRC May 2021

⁷ LPR1.95 – Network Rail letter of 30 June 2021

completions are moved back slightly to 2031. Given the housing need and the ability for Lenham Heathlands to comprehensively secure a variety of well-designed homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community I am satisfied that the site can reasonably and consistently yield 160-240 homes per annum, possibly slightly more, including in combination with development at the nearby Lenham Broad Location. Issues of viability at Heathlands have been raised and discussed at the hearings. I will address these in my final report but there is nothing fundamental at this stage that indicates that the allocation cannot deliver in accordance with the identified policy requirements, including the proposed main modifications.

5.11 In summary, the detail of the submitted Lenham Heathlands Policy LPRSP4(a) is not sound. Accordingly, the following is required for plan soundness:

- In principle, those proposed modifications for Lenham Heathlands set out in LPRSUB011, subsequently updated in ED59, and identified in the attached schedule to this letter would be main modifications and therefore necessary for soundness. Some of the detailed content of the proposed modifications may require refinement, including from the satisfactory conclusion of dialogue with Natural England on the HRA and the Stodmarsh Ramsar/SPA/SAC allowing for assessment against an updated neutrality budget framework.
- Identification of a railway station within phase 1 of the phasing and infrastructure table as per ED59 would be necessary for soundness and to ensure the policy fully aligns with the SA assessment.
- In particular, I recommend the various main modifications in ED59 / ED67, including the substantive re-writing of part 3 of the Policy on landscape to ensure the policy is effective in light of the soundness concerns raised by the Kent Downs AONB Unit and Natural England, amongst others.
- Additional work is needed to inform that at a proportionately, high level that off-site improvements to Junction 8 of M20 would be deliverable. This should be confirmed through an updated Statement of Common Ground with National Highways as indicated on Day 7 of the hearings.
- Finally, I have requested a brief update paper from the Council on water treatment and quality at Heathlands. This would inform whether further modifications to policy would be necessary in addition to those already presented at in the phasing/infrastructure table and part 5d) in ED59.

Lidsing (Policy LPRSP4(b))

5.12 Lidsing has been appropriately assessed through plan preparation as one of the reasonable options to accommodate large scale development in the Borough. The fact that the site is adjacent to the Medway towns, in another administrative area, should not preclude Lidsing being assessed as an option to secure a sustainable pattern of development for Maidstone Borough. Whilst I note the strong objections of Medway Council and local Medway MPs,

the issues identified are matters of Plan soundness. Medway Council has confirmed it raises no objection on the legal duty to cooperate. My final report will deal with all the soundness matters raised but I address below those that require particular attention and where the policy as submitted is not sound.

- 5.13 The site is adjacent to and between existing urban areas of Medway and so, the reality is that the Lidsing proposal would to a significant degree function and be regarded as part of the wider Medway Towns conurbation. Nonetheless, it is justified that plan-preparation has considered whether the site is a location that could deliver garden community principles and a degree of self-containment given its overall scale at 2,000 homes and 14ha of employment land. I have found that in broad terms that Lidsing would meet the locational requirements for large-scale development as set out at NPPF paragraph 73.
- 5.14 The allocation seeks to deliver an east-west highway connection through the site and access to the strategic road network would require an improved connection to the adjacent M2. The submitted plan proposes this via improvements to Junction 4, immediately to the east of the proposed allocation. Various constraints mean the proposed allocation cannot connect to the existing Junction 4 via Hoath Way and the proposed solution therefore is to create a new fourth arm at the junction. This would require replacing the existing Maidstone Road overbridge with a new realigned bridge and a new arc of approach road to the south of the existing junction. This new approach road, embanking and lighting would be within the Kent Downs AONB.
- 5.15 It is legitimate, for National Highways, to be assured that the proposed means of connecting into Junction 4 would be safe in the terms expressed at NPPF paragraph 111 and in general accordance with DMRB⁸ standards. It is accepted that further work in this regard is required for plan soundness and is ongoing. I will require the output of that work, proportionate to plan-making, in order to be confident that the Lidsing proposal would be developable and therefore effective in helping to meet development needs. Given delays to this examination to date, I want to express caution on the need for realistic timeframes so that I, and those with an interest in Lidsing, can consider the outputs from this additional work, including at a reopened hearing session if necessary. A key action for the Council will be to liaise and establish with the site promoter and National Highways a practical but economical timeframe for its production and agreement and to advise me of this via the programme officer.
- 5.16 The TA work to date in ED53(a)-(c), identifies a potential number of off-site junctions in Medway that would require improvement as a consequence of traffic generation arising from the proposed allocation. Whilst there are detailed concerns from Medway Council and others regarding the inputs in the TA and the practical delivery of off-site improvements, these are matters of

⁸ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges

detail that would be more appropriately left to a future planning application. I do, however, consider it necessary for soundness that the policy for Lidsing is clear that off-site highway improvements will be necessary in the Medway area and to identify in which indicative phasing period they would be required. This would require a proposed main modification to Policy LPRSP4(b) at 6(g).

- 5.17 In respect of highway impacts south of Lidsing to connect to Maidstone, strategic modelling shows the potential for a significant number of additional car trips in this direction, including via Boxley. In respect of Boxley I share the concerns of the Parish Council and Kent County Council regarding the potential volume of additional vehicle numbers through the historic core of the village where the highway width is restricted. Due to heritage assets it is difficult to envisage what practical measures could be delivered in Boxley to alleviate potential impacts on the highway and general amenity of the village. The TA assumes penalties to deter the number of movements south such that the alternative, albeit longer route to Maidstone via the M2 and A229 would be preferred. I consider this needs to be progressed further, including dialogue with Kent County Council on the potential effectiveness of 'penalties' and whether there needs to be some additional specificity in the policy to protect Boxley and also Bredhurst. I need to be assured that the proposed main modification requiring further assessment, including mitigations in Boxley, Bredhurst and on the A229 and A249 corridors would be effective and the extent to which it has been justified by the voluminous amount of detail already provided in the TA work before this examination. A statement of common ground with Kent County Council in this regard would be helpful, if it can be secured.
- 5.18 As part of the Habitat Regulations Assessment, the impact of air quality on qualifying features of the North Downs Woodland SAC is an issue. Whilst it is not exclusive to Lidsing I raise it here because it is an intervening habitat between the proposed allocation and the Maidstone urban area. I note that work is ongoing as part of updating the Plan's HRA and dialogue is progressing with Natural England to find an approach whereby a positive appropriate assessment outcome could be secured [ED69]. At this stage, I do not see it as a showstopper to progressing to the Stage 2 hearings. I would, however, like an update, possibly by means of a revised Statement of Common Ground with Natural England by no later than 31 March 2023.
- 5.19 The proposed housing and employment development at Lidsing would be outside of but within the setting of the dip slope of the Kent Downs AONB. As set out above, the highway connection to the M2 would require land within the AONB. Paragraph 177 of the NPPF states that for development within AONBs, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances. The proposed highway within the AONB requires approximately 1ha of land and would involve a considerable length of new single carriageway spur, elevated on an embankment to cross over the M2 via a new over-bridge and with various lighting columns and signage. Having regard to the proposed nature and scale of the development and its potential

to adversely impact the purpose of the AONB I find that the proposed scale of the highway works would amount to major development.

- 5.20 In applying criteria (a)-(c) at NPPF paragraph 177 given the wider allocation is outside of the AONB I have focused my consideration on the connection to the strategic road network at the M2. There is a need for a direct connection to the M2 to serve the allocation and avoid harm to the surrounding road network. Whilst some early development may be feasible without it, later phases of the housing as well as the employment development will require the link. More widely, an east-west link through the site, has the potential to offer appreciable transport benefits including for bus circulation between existing communities in the Medway Towns.
- 5.23 In terms of the scope for connections to the M2 to avoid the AONB, this is challenging as the M2 forms the boundary to the AONB. Other options to accommodate a connection to the M2 have been explored and appropriately considered in LPR5.6, ED21 and ED53⁹. Alternative options, including those that would also require land within the AONB, have been appropriately discounted. In terms of detrimental effect to the AONB, I find the large, generally featureless 20ha arable field within which the proposed highway works would be accommodated has relatively few key landscape characteristics of the AONB. There are no public footpaths across it and only very limited biodiversity value. At night, I observed that lighting from the adjacent M2 is visible within this part of AONB and the current traffic noise means this is not a tranquil location. When assessed against the factors listed in criterion c) of NPPF paragraph 177 there would be only a limited detrimental impact.
- 5.24 Of the 20ha host field, approximately 19ha would be available for landscaping, biodiversity and appropriate public access. As such the harm would be significantly moderated. I do consider, however, that a main modification to part 3 of LPRSP4(b) is necessary to ensure that the 19ha is clearly secured for the intended mitigation and subsequently reflected in the SPD and masterplanning process¹⁰. Overall, drawing this all together, I find that exceptional circumstances, in the terms set out at NPPF paragraph 177, exist in relation to the necessary highway works for Lidsing as major development within the AONB.
- 5.25 The allocation is immediately to the north of the AONB and within its setting. The policy as submitted seeks to mitigate the impact but it would be too broad-brush and therefore not effective in terms of securing necessary mitigation. I recognise that the Kent Downs AONB Unit has residual objections to the allocation but has nonetheless sought to assist the examination including an updated statement of Common Ground [ED68]. Accordingly, I recommend the further modifications are incorporated into part 3 of the Policy based on Appendix 1 in the statement of common ground with

⁹ Strategic Road Network Access – Options Appraisal by Charles & Associates

¹⁰ As shown, indicatively, at Appendix 7 to ED68

the AONB Unit as being necessary for effectiveness and consistency with national policy at NPPF paragraph 176.

- 5.26 The submitted policy identifies a number of infrastructure requirements to meet the needs of the development. As matters have progressed, updates to Policy LPRSP4(b) are necessary as expressed in LPRSUB011, including the proposed table of infrastructure and phasing, and as discussed on Day 10 of the hearings including enabling the provision of a medical facility. These modifications will be necessary for plan soundness for effectiveness.
- 5.27 As submitted the Plan considers that Lidsing would start delivering first completions in 2027/28, immediately ramping up to 130 units per annum. I find the date for initial completions optimistic by at least a year given the various stages that follow plan adoption and that a more realistic scenario would also see an incremental delivery profile in the first two years (similar as is being outlined at Invicta Barracks). The scheme is anticipated to have a maximum annual output at 130dpa. That is broadly reasonable, albeit possibly on the cautious side once the site is fully up and running. As such, this feeds into my separate conclusion below that the overall housing trajectory in the Plan needs to be stepped.
- 5.28 In summary the detail of the submitted Lidsing Policy LPRSP4(a) is not sound. Accordingly, the following is required for plan soundness:
- Additional evidence or conformation of the evidence in ED53, proportionate to plan-making, to demonstrate at a strategic, high level, that safe connection can be achieved via a new fourth arm to Junction 4 of the M2.
 - Additional liaison with Kent County Council on the effectiveness of the TA work to date on 'penalties' for traffic movements south, including impacts on A229 corridor.
 - Additional detail in part 3 of the Policy, based on the content at Appendix 1 of the SoCG with the Kent Downs AONB Unit in ED68.
 - Additional wording in part 6(g) of the policy that off-site highway improvements will be required in Medway.
 - Additional policy content to ensure that the 19ha of mitigatory landscaping south of the M2 is secured and factored into the SPD and masterplan.
 - The various proposed modifications presented in LPRSUB011, updated where necessary by the above, and as confirmed in the schedule to this letter.
 - A revised trajectory for housing delivery

Invicta Barracks (Policy LPRSP5(b))

- 5.29 The submitted Plan at Policy LPRSP5(b) provides a degree of continuity from the 2017 Local Plan, which found that a strategic policy framework to enable the delivery of some 1,300 homes at the site was soundly based. Whilst there are appreciable areas of environmental and heritage sensitivity it would be untenable, in the context of increasing housing need, not to continue to consider the development potential of the large areas of workshops, hardstanding, ancillary buildings and modern residential accommodation

across this site which are confirmed for disposal by 2029 (with some scope for an earlier land parcel release). The site occupies a highly sustainable location close to Maidstone town centre. The principle of continuing the allocation in the submitted plan therefore remains sound.

- 5.30 In terms of the potential capacity of the site, there are a number of constraints that will inform this, not least the Grade II* listed Park House and Walled Garden and their settings, the high-quality sylvan environment through the heart of the site, other areas of woodland within the site and the undulating topography, especially around Park House. Accordingly, the significant volume of evidence to the examination demonstrates the reasonableness of a capacity of some 1,300 homes as an efficient use of previously developed land. To ensure the plan is positively prepared I recommend a proposed main modification that 1,300 homes should be expressed with some flexibility so as not to inhibit the potential for additional modest supply should that be supported by more detailed analysis in support of planning applications. Allied to this I also recommend a further main modification that the policy is accompanied by a concept framework diagram which identifies the known constraints and would provide a high-level plan from which to develop a detailed masterplan alongside the intended SPD for the site.
- 5.31 The capacity of the wider site is also affected by the potential to deliver a new through-school including additional secondary school capacity to potentially support this site but mainly for the benefit of other development in the town. Whilst the need and timing of the school is likely to be the subject of further work and scrutiny, a suitably worded proposed main modification would support the principle of its delivery at this location, whilst giving suitable flexibility for alternative uses should the school use no longer be required. I recommend this as part of the schedule of proposed main modifications as confirmed in the latest statement of common ground with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation in document ED63.
- 5.32 I note the concerns of the local highway authority on the phasing of off-site highway works in the proposed modifications and the relative detail of what these might comprise. Whilst I have no objection to parallel work being undertaken to potentially address these points, in respect of this site I do not consider that the examination should be unduly delayed by work which may well be better part of the SPD process and subsequently a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) alongside planning applications. The proposed phasing is necessarily 'indicative' and the requirement for off-site highway works is identified. An alternative approach could be to assign such works into Phase 1 to protect the Highway authority's position, accepting that a detailed TA will identify the necessity and the precise form of any off-site highway works in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 110 and 111.

5.33 In summary for the Invicta Barracks site I recommend the following:

- The site capacity is identified as reasonably being a target of 1300 homes, and not a limit as expressed on plan submission.
- All of the proposed modifications for Invicta Barracks set out in LPRSUB011, with subsequent updating through the Statement of Common Ground [ED63] and discussion at Day 11 of the hearings, would be main modifications and therefore necessary for soundness.
- An indicative framework diagram within the Plan alongside the policy would be necessary for soundness.
- It is reasonable that the housing trajectory makes an allowance for early on-site delivery of 50 units from 2027/28 onwards, stepping up to a judicious annual output of 150dpa from 2032/33 for the remainder of the plan period.

The Leeds Langley Corridor (Policy LPRSP5(a))

- 5.34 As set out above I am concerned that the submitted plan is not justified or effective in its approach to this location for 'potential' development. In seeking to safeguard a route for a relief road for communities along the B2163 in Leeds and Langley the Plan is in essence putting a marker down for a broad location for strategic growth, the quantum and detail of which is deferred to another round of plan making. Whilst Kent County Council support the principle of a relief road there would be no funding for it and so its delivery, at a current indicative cost of £57million, would necessitate enabling development. Technical work to date identifies that approximately 4,000 homes would be required to viably fund its delivery. As set out above Leeds Langley, although tested in early SA work (the Eastern Orbital Road Corridor Option) was discounted due to its relatively poor performance against SA objectives. Notwithstanding progress through a recent position statement [ED52] there remains a lack of certainty on delivery, reflecting the various land ownerships and degrees of commitment to pursuing a strategic allocation at this time. In this context it is justifiable that the corridor was not assessed as one of the reasonable options for large scale garden community type development when preparing the submission document.
- 5.35 Without fettering future plan-making it is also clear that development in this location would not be without issue, including the setting of the Kent Downs AONB, proximity of heritage assets (notably Leeds Castle), the Len valley landscape, its detachment from the Maidstone Urban Area and lack of transport choices and potential impacts on the M20 Junction 8. Additionally, delivery of the road will require a comprehensive approach, such that it is difficult to conceive how early or piecemeal land releases in this location could reasonably contribute to the coherent delivery of the road.
- 5.36 I am mindful that a relief road has been a long-held objective through successive plan documents, reflecting considerable local support from those rural communities east of Maidstone that are adversely affected by current traffic flows. I am also cognisant that Policy LPR1 in the 2017 Local Plan kept

the door open and anticipated this Plan Review could adopt a positively prepared approach based on further evidence. As submitted Policy LPRSP5(a) does relatively little to substantially move matters forward and effectively puts in place the foundations for a third large scale development through this Plan without the same degree of evidence that sits behind the Heathlands and Lidsing proposals. To progress a sound Plan that contained Leeds-Langley as a potential development option, the Council would need to pause the examination and work with all the landowners to ensure a more positively prepared approach that is demonstrably 'developable' through an associated evidence base which addresses, amongst other things, the issues at paragraph 5.35 above. As set out above, the submitted spatial strategy without Leeds Langley can broadly meet the identified development needs over the extended plan period and can do so as part of a sustainable pattern for development. Accordingly, it would not be necessary for the soundness of the Plan that additional, long-term potential capacity is identified at Leeds-Langley. On this basis, I see no need or benefit in repeating or reinserting an LPR1 type policy in this Plan Review for soundness. I also find little justification that safeguarding the area would provide confidence or certainty for landowners to invest in promoting an allocation as part of a future round of plan-making. Obtaining allocations involves an element of risk and cost for landowners and site promoters and I see no strong reason for making an exception here.

- 5.37 In terms of the safeguarding function of Policy LPRS5(b) I note that there are relatively few alignments available to achieve a connection for the relief road from the A274 to the A20. Whilst proposed modifications to the policy would enable a more pragmatic approach for smaller developments, overall, I find the policy as submitted attempts to cover too many bases. This includes pre-emptively seeking financial contributions to the road, the basis of which is likely to be challenging in the context of the tests in the CIL Regulations. Overall, as submitted, and when taking account of proposed modifications in LPRSUB011, the policy would not enable decision-makers to be evident in how they should react to a development proposal in this area. This would be contrary to paragraph 16 of the NPPF.
- 5.38 Moreover, the risk of development in this rural part of the Borough preventing a longer-term ambition for the road is slim. The area is 'countryside' for the purposes of planning policy, it is not adjacent to the Maidstone urban area and so any windfall development should be limited to those requiring a specific rural location in this part of the Borough. As set out below, I consider there are modifications necessary to strengthen the Plan and so limit the scope for speculative, large scale windfall developments in any interim period before a further development plan document could set out a positively prepared approach to Leeds Langley. If this is deemed to be an appropriate strategy when compared against reasonable alternative options at that time.
- 5.39 In conclusion, I find it necessary for plan soundness that the potential development location at Leeds-Langley is removed from Policy LPRSS1 and

Policy LPRSP5(a) is deleted and the Policies Map amended accordingly. The option of Leeds Langley remains a matter for the Council when preparing future development plan documents and the technical work to date, as a foundation, is not invalidated by my initial conclusions above. I appreciate this finding will be of particular disappointment to the Council but I am concerned that the approach to Leeds Langley in the submitted Plan would unduly pre-determine future spatial choices. The Council will undoubtedly want to reflect on this and determine whether it wishes to continue with the examination to Stage 2 on the basis of a proposed main modification to delete Leeds Langley.

6. Housing Land Supply

- 6.1 The Stage 1 hearings have enabled a strategic overview of housing land supply. I will deal with the issue in more detail in my final report but in headline terms I find the Council's approach to a windfall allowance and the application of a 5% buffer to be justified. With the exception of a small number of strategic sites, I find the evidence in ED66 demonstrates that the Council has, to date, soundly profiled much of its deliverable and developable supply, including evidence of constructive and appropriate engagement with site promoters and developers. I am satisfied that at least 10% of the housing requirement will come forward on sites of no more than 1 hectare in accordance with NPPF paragraph 69(a).
- 6.2 Taking this into account and without prejudice to more detailed examination of sources of supply in Maidstone town centre on the non-strategic allocations, the Council's most recent evidence nonetheless shows only a 5.14 year supply as of 1 April 2022 against the higher 1,157dpa housing requirement. I am concerned that this is a fragile situation, in particular the reliance on allocations in the submitted plan needing to start delivering in earnest in years 4 and 5. Whilst there are encouraging signs of some allocations already progressing to the planning application stage the overall supply picture means it would only take a small number of key sites to falter before potential outcomes arise contrary to the plan-led approach which the Council is seeking to maintain through this expedient plan review.
- 6.3 There is evidence that the Council has historically taken a cautious approach to assessing site capacities, and delivery rates. This is shown in recent levels of significant over-delivery (162% on the latest Housing Delivery Test). However, this cannot be relied upon to assume that the 5.14 year position would not worsen.
- 6.4 Additionally, as set out above, this is a bold Plan which has positively allocated large-scale development for longer term benefits. Accordingly, the Local Plan Review for Maidstone epitomises the very circumstances at PPG

paragraph 021¹¹ which would justify the use of a stepped trajectory. I have raised this previously [ED2 & ED4] and whilst the Council is to be commended for continuing to test whether supply could be robustly maintained against a consistent annual housing requirement, the latest figure of 5.14 years is uncomfortably risky for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 68 a). As such, I consider it necessary for plan soundness to steer the Council to a more robust housing land supply position. This would ensure valuable plan-led certainty in the short to medium term. I would therefore advise the Council to undertake the following.

- 6.6 The evidence exists in ED66 for the Council to soundly apply a 3% non-implementation rate based on local monitoring as opposed to the more cautious 5% that has been used. The evidence potentially supports a 2% non-implementation rate, but I find 3% would be a prudent figure, erring on the side of caution, and I strongly recommend that the Council applies it.
- 6.7 In 2021/22, delivery was 1,627 dwellings, 470 homes in excess of the housing requirement of 1,157dpa. This over-supply should be positively factored into the housing trajectory such that it could justify a lower target in the first five years from 1 April 2022.
- 6.8 These two measures would improve matters, but I also consider it necessary for soundness that the Council applies a stepped trajectory on the following lines:
- (i) A lower housing target for years 1-5 on adoption (2022-2027) in part to factor in the early over-delivery that has occurred in 2021/22 but also to (a) sensibly regulate the significant step-change from 883dpa to 1,157dpa; and (b) protect the sound spatial strategy until Invicta Barracks, Lidsing, Heathlands and Lenham Broad Location start to ratchet up delivery in unison, generally from 2029 onwards. As a guide, a housing target in the region of 1,000 dpa in years 1-5 would represent a meaningful uplift (>10%) on the current 883dpa.
 - (ii) In years 6-10 the trajectory should step up accordingly and continue through years 11-15 at a higher rate when various strategic sites and other local plan allocations and town centre sites should be cumulatively delivering, together with the potential windfall supply which the Council has justified in ED66.
- 6.9 The strategic sites examined in Stage 1 are not intended to deliver within the five year period (2022-2027) with the exception of some modest early delivery from 2027 on the Invicta Barracks site. That is reasonable. As set out above, the trajectory needs to be amended to reflect that delivery on Lidsing would not be until 2028/29 and would gradually ramp up to 130dpa by 2030/1. On Heathlands, first completions should be profiled to commence in 2031. Allied to Heathlands, delivery at the Lenham Broad Location should also put back to 2031 to sensibly safeguard against the lead-in times to deliver mitigation in

¹¹ Paragraph 68-021-20190722, Housing Land Supply & Delivery, Planning Practice Guidance

relation to Stodmarsh. I also consider these timeframes more realistically reflect the timeframes required for SPD and approval of initial applications and the agreement of what are likely to be complex planning obligations. I stress that I consider these to be the worse-case, most-cautious scenarios and would not preclude sites coming forward earlier if progress is maintained.

- 6.11 I also consider it will be necessary for soundness to include a new Policy 'LPRSP10 Housing Delivery'. The policy should: (i) reaffirm the overall housing requirement; (ii) link to an updated stepped housing trajectory; and (iii) explain how deliverable supply should be assessed in Maidstone Borough. The policy should also countenance what would happen were housing delivery to unexpectedly worsen, such that the tilted balance becomes engaged. It is not necessary for soundness to repeat NPPF (paragraph 11(d)) but the new policy could, as an example, specify how it would boost supply in sustainable locations until such time as a new plan was in place. This could safeguard the Council from difficult speculative applications.
- 6.12 In advance of the Stage 2 hearings I would like the Council to update ED66 to reflect the above and include the Council's preferred approach for a stepped trajectory. ED66 currently identifies a modest shortfall arising towards the end of the plan period. I do not consider this makes the plan unsound. At the same time I would like the Council to draft a new Policy LPRSP10 as a proposed main modification. It would be my intention that these would be available for comment and discussion at the Stage 2 hearings, including a final further session on Housing Land Supply once I have considered all the non-strategic allocations and town centre opportunity sites.

7. Next Steps

- 7.1 The significance of this letter is that a number of the strategic policies in the plan as submitted are not sound. There are also ongoing matters to ensure that the Plan can satisfactorily meet the requirements of Habitat Regulations Assessment. However, at this stage, I am satisfied that the Plan can be made justified, effective and consistent with national policy through a series of main modifications, a significant number of which have been presented by the Council in documents LPRSUB011, ED59 and/or through Statements of Common Ground with statutory consultees and site promoters. The Council may wish to reflect on the further main modifications I have outlined above and inform me via the Programme Officer on how it wishes to proceed and whether there would be any significant issues with what I have recommended.
- 7.2 On a positive note, and subject to the timing of outputs for the additional work discussed at the hearings and identified above, I would like to be a position to hold Stage 2 hearings as soon as possible. I will liaise shortly through the Programme Officer on a timeframe for this, including where feasible the use of on-line sessions for less contentious and more technical matters (for example, a number of the development management policies). This should create efficiencies in time and costs for the examination.

7.3 I would like to stress that in coming to this initial position that I have fully considered all the evidence and information available and taken full account of written submissions and discussions at the hearing sessions. The Council and others have had adequate opportunity to make submissions and provide evidence. I am not expecting further submissions from interested parties regarding the merits of these interim conclusions. I would, however, request that this correspondence is uploaded on the examination website. I would also be grateful if the Council could inform me via the Programme Officer on the timescale for the additional information / evidence identified in this letter.

Yours sincerely

David Spencer

Inspector.

ENCS. Appendix - Summary schedule of proposed main modifications from Stage 1

Appendix

Maidstone Local Plan Review Examination
Summary schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (MMs) – Post Stage 1 Hearings

Introduction, Spatial Vision & Objectives

Para	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
2.19	Reference to Marine Management Organisation	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness
4.2	Amend text to clarify that implementation of the spatial strategy will cover the plan period and beyond	As discussed on Day 1, Inspector recommendation	Consistency with national policy
4.6	Amend AONB terminology as per national planning policy	As per LPRSUB011	Consistency with national policy
4.7	Additional text on the timely implementation of necessary waste water infrastructure	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness

LPRSS1 Spatial Strategy

Policy part	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
1 st Header	Amend Plan Period 2021 - 2038	As per ED61	Consistency with national policy
1.	Amend plan period and amend housing requirement to 'at least' 19,669 new dwellings	As per ED61	Consistency with national policy,
2.	Amend plan period and update / extrapolate floorspace figures	As per ED61	Consistency with national policy
3.	Amend plan period and update floorspace figures	As per ED61	Consistency with national policy
7.	Delete reference to Leeds Langley as a potential development location	Inspector recommendation	Justified & effective

8.	Clarifications on key employments sites	As per ED61	Justified & Effective
----	---	-------------	-----------------------

LPRSP4(a) Heathlands

Policy part / para	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
Para 6.71	Updated vision to reflect site delivery beyond the plan period	As per ED60	Consistency with national policy
New paragraph	Further content on the requirements for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	As per ED59	Effectiveness
1 (a)	<p>Insert new table showing phasing period, quantum of development and indicative infrastructure interdependencies, particularly the trigger point for a Strategic Outline Business Case for a new railway station, delivery of a new railway station in phase 1, further content and revised timing on nutrient neutrality mitigation.</p> <p>Amend development quantum to reflect revised delivery / trajectory</p>	As per LPRSUB011 as amended by ED59	Effectiveness, positively prepared, justified
1 (b)	Confirm mineral extraction as per Kent Minerals and Waste Plan	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness
3	Substantively re-write part 3 of the policy regarding landscaping and mitigation of impacts on Kent Downs AONB	As per ED59 and ED67 (para 7.2)	Effectiveness, justified and consistency with national policy
5 (b)	Amend primary school provision	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness
5 (c)	Amend secondary school provision	As per ED59	Effectiveness
5 (d)	Additional policy content on waste water treatment	As per ED59	Effectiveness

5 (g)	Insert new provision for delivery of a medical facility	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness
6	Various amendments to transport infrastructure requirements, including the clarified commitment to a new rail station and additional specificity at e) on M20 junction and at f) on the role of SPD regarding junction impacts on A20	As per LPRSUB011 and ED59	Effectiveness
7	Various amendments to biodiversity and heritage requirements	As per LPRSUB011 and ED59	Effectiveness
8	Various amendments to governance considerations	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness

LPRSP4(b) Lidsing

Policy part	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
1 (a)	<p>Insert new table showing phasing period, quantum of development and indicative infrastructure interdependencies.</p> <p>Amend development quantum to reflect revised delivery / trajectory</p>	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness, positively prepared, justified
3	Re-write part 3 of the policy regarding landscaping and mitigation of impacts on Kent Downs AONB.	Initially in LPRSUB011 but provided in more detail as per Appendix 1 to ED68	Effectiveness, justified and consistency with national policy
3	New policy content to be added to the 'Masterplanning' section to clarify that the balance of land south of the M2 not used for highway infrastructure will be utilised for green infrastructure, including	Inspector recommendation	Effectiveness

	areas for public access, the details of which will be developed through the SPD and masterplanning processes		
5	Include new criterion to reference a medical facility	As discussed at the hearing. Inspector recommendation	Effectiveness
6	Various amendments to transport infrastructure requirements	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness
6(g)	Expand proposed MM to include reference to off-site junction improvements within the Medway area subject to further TA work	Inspector recommendation	Effectiveness
7	Various amendments to biodiversity and heritage requirements	As per LPRSUB011	Effectiveness

LPRSP5(a) Leeds-Langley Corridor

Policy part	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
LPRSP5(a)	Delete	Inspector recommendation	Justified
Policies Map	Delete safeguarding area	Inspector recommendation	Justified

LPRSP5(b) Invicta Barracks

Policy part	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
Headline text	Clarify that the 1,300 dwellings for the site is a target (around which there would be some flexibility), not a limit	LPRSUB011	Positively prepared
1 (a)	Insert new table showing phasing period, quantum of development and indicative	As per LPRSUB011 and ED63	Effectiveness, positively prepared, justified

	infrastructure interdependencies. Amend development quantum to reflect revised delivery / trajectory		
3 & new Point 13	Delete reference to school and include new point 13 to provide clarity regarding potential on-site provision (with corresponding updates to the phasing table (1 (a)) above.	As per LPRSUB011 and ED63	Justified and effectiveness
7	Amend reference for biodiversity net gain to be in accordance with Policy LPRS14(A)	As per ED63 and Inspector recommendation	Effectiveness
9	Delete reference to removing existing development at 1-8 The Crescent	As per ED63 and Inspector recommendation	Justified and Effectiveness
New Point 12	Insert requirement to retain Hindu Place of Worship	As per ED63 and Inspector Recommendation	Justified and Effectiveness
New and update to paragraph 6.94	Insert an indicative framework diagram to inform SPD and masterplanning (based on Appendix 1 to ED63)	As per ED63 and Inspector recommendation	Effectiveness

Other

Plan part	Summary of Proposed MM	Source	Soundness Issue
Para 2.12	Insert clarification on those policies to be considered	Discussed on Day 1 of hearings	Consistency with national policy

	'strategic policies' for Neighbourhood Plan preparation		
New	Insert new appendix making clear which policies are superseded or rolled forward into the LPR and those 2017 Local Plan policies which remain 'saved'	ED9	Effectiveness and consistency with national policy
Key Diagram	Remove Leeds Langley Corridor	Inspector Recommendation	Justified and effectiveness
LPRSP10	Insert new policy 'Housing Delivery' reaffirming the housing requirement, embedding a housing trajectory and consider additional policy content to manage development proposals where housing delivery performance triggers a tilted balance	Inspector Recommendation	
Appendix 1 – Housing Trajectory	Update to reflect a new stepped trajectory and detail on key sources of supply – similar to as presented in ED66	Inspector Recommendation	Effectiveness

Ends.

