

## APPENDIX A – Summary of comments and proposed amendments to the Development in the Green Belt SPD

### Chapter 2 – Overview of Green Belt Policies

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB17	Christine Lane	Edenbridge Town Council	Support subject to changes	* Concerned that the definition of Green Belt in paragraph 2.1 is misleading, as it could be interpreted that the Green Belt exists to retain countryside.	* Noted, however paragraph 2.1 reflects the definition of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF – no change.
GB38	Brian Lloyd	CPRE Protect Kent	Support subject to changes	<p>* Paragraph 1.2 should be amended – SPDs do not form part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>* The word ‘acceptable’ in paragraph 4.6 should be amended to ‘appropriate’ to reflect the language used in the NPPF.</p> <p>* The description of the term ‘development plan documents’ in the glossary should be amended to remove the reference to SPDs.</p>	<p>* Agree – the NPPF states that SPDs are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan. Amend paragraph 1.2:</p> <p><del>‘Once adopted, the SPD provides additional information to assist with the interpretation and implementation of policies set out in the Core Strategy and Allocations and Development Management Plan (ADMP), and is will form part of Sevenoaks District Council’s Local Plan (also known as the Local Development Framework) and will be used by the District Council in determining planning applications.’</del></p> <p>* Agree – amend paragraph 4.6:</p> <p><del>‘To avoid increasing impact, conversions that involve disproportionate extensions will not be considered acceptable appropriate...’</del></p> <p>* Agree – amend the term ‘Development Plan Documents (DPD)’ in the Glossary to exclude Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>

				* References to the 'proposals map' should be amended to 'policies map'.	* Agree – amend paragraph 1.6 and the Glossary to replace the word 'proposals' with 'policies'.
GB39	Liz Shier	Kent County Council	Support subject to changes	* The Green Belt policies in the ADMP are repeated in the SPD – considered unnecessary and should be removed from the SPD.	* Noted, however it is considered that the inclusion of the Green Belt policies in the SPD provide clarity for the reader and prevents cross referencing – no change.
GB40	Liz Shier	Kent County Council	Support subject to changes	* Policy GB4 should be amended to require replacement dwellings to harmonise with the historic character of the surrounding area with respect to layout, materials, massing and scale.	* Noted, however policy GB4 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.

### Chapter 3 – Limited Residential Infill in Villages in the Green Belt

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB3	Jennifer Wilson	Environment Agency	Support	No further comments received.	* Support noted – no change.
GB6	Trevor Hall	Kent Police	Object	No further comments received.	* Objection noted – no change.
GB41	Alan Gunne-Jones	Planning & Development Associates	Object	<p>* Paragraph 3.1 states that 'development within villages in the Green Belt is limited to small scale infilling'. This is not consistent with Core Strategy policy L07 which refers to 'infilling and redevelopment on a small scale' or the NPPF which refers to limited infilling.</p> <p>* Paragraph 3.2 misrepresents the NPPF – limited infilling is not inappropriate development, and there is no reference to preserving the</p>	<p>* Noted, however it is considered that paragraph 3.1 is consistent with Core Strategy policy L07 and NPPF paragraph 89 – no change.</p> <p>* Agree in part – NPPF paragraph 89 considers exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Amend paragraph 3.2 for clarity:</p>

				<p>openness of the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Paragraph 3.3 definition of infilling is considered too restrictive and contrary to the NPPF. The paragraph should be deleted.</li> <li>* Paragraph 3.4 definition of substantially built up frontage too restrictive and precludes appropriate development within Core Strategy policy L07 settlements. The paragraph should be deleted.</li> </ul>	<p>'The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that limited infilling in villages, <u>and limited infilling of brownfield sites which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, are</u> is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, provided it preserves the openness of the Green Belt.'</p> <p>* Noted, however neither the NPPF nor NPPG provide a definition of 'infilling', therefore the SPD aims to provide clarity on what is and is not acceptable. The main aim of Green Belt policy is to keep land open, therefore infill development beyond an appropriate scale would compromise the purposes of the Green Belt. It is considered that paragraph 3.3 provides such clarity – no change.</p> <p>* Noted, however neither the NPPF nor NPPG provide guidance on what constitutes an appropriate location for infilling, therefore the SPD aims to provide clarity on where infilling is and is not acceptable. By its very nature, in order to 'infill' a piece of land, it requires existing development either side, and Core Strategy policy L07 resists development outside of defined boundaries. It is considered that paragraph 3.4 provides such clarity – no change.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

#### Chapter 4 – Conversion of Buildings in the Green Belt

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB11	Phil Aelen	DHA Planning	Support subject to changes	* The reference in paragraph 4.2 to Core Strategy policy SP8 which sets out the Council's preference for	* Noted, however Core Strategy policy SP8 is an adopted policy and cannot be changed through the SPD – no change.

			<p>commercial re-use rather than residential is not consistent with NPPF paragraph 55 and should be deleted.</p> <p>* NPPF paragraph 90 notes that the re-use of buildings is not inappropriate providing that they are 'of permanent and substantial construction'. However ADMP policy GB7(b) states that the should be 'capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction that would detract from their original character'. This is a more onerous test than the NPPF and should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>* Paragraph 4.4 requires 'at least 75% of the original structure maintained' – this is an unjustified approach and should be deleted.</p>	<p>* Noted, however neither the NPPF nor NPPG provide guidance on what constitutes a building that is 'of permanent and substantial construction', therefore the SPD aims to provide clarity on the matter. By quantifying what the applicant needs to demonstrate in submitting an application for the re-use of a building within the Green Belt, it is considered that criterion b) in policy GB7 provides such clarity. In addition policy GB7 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</p> <p>* Noted, however paragraph 4.4 sets out that the conversion of a building that requires substantial rebuilding in order to make it suitable for re-use will not be permitted. In order to quantify this, the Council suggests that at least 75% of the original structure should be maintained to protect its character. However, this is only a starting point, and the paragraph is suitably flexible to recognise that a lesser proportion could be acceptable – no change.</p>
GB18	Holly Ivaldi	Eynsford Parish Council	<p>Object</p> <p>* ADMP policy GB7 is much weaker than Local Plan policy GB3B.</p> <p>* The wording needs to be robust enough to prevent agricultural buildings being built under permitted development where the intention may be to convert to residential at a later date – applications should require agricultural justification for proposals. Suggested wording: 'Where little or no</p>	<p>* Noted, however policy GB7 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</p> <p>* Noted, however paragraph 4.7 addresses this concern. There has been a recent change to the General Permitted Development Order affecting agricultural buildings therefore an additional paragraph is proposed under paragraph 4.7:</p> <p><u>'4.8 In April 2014, permitted development rights were amended to allow the change of use of'</u></p>

				<p>agricultural use has been made of the building and a request for conversion is received, removal of the building should be the preferred option'.</p> <p>* ADMP policy GB7 may encourage speculative building in the Green Belt.</p>	<p><u>agricultural buildings and land to residential to be considered under prior approval, rather than the submission of a full planning application. This applies to agricultural buildings up to 450 square metres for conversion to a maximum of three dwellings, providing there is no increase to the external dimension of the existing building. Home owners and developers who are considering such conversions are encouraged to refer to this guidance.'</u></p> <p>* Noted, however policy GB7 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</p>
GB33	J L Phillips	Tandridge District Council	Support	<p>* Agrees that the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt may be appropriate, providing there is no additional impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>* Considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p>	<p>* Support noted – no change.</p> <p>* Support noted – no change.</p>

## Chapter 5 – Residential Extensions and Replacement Dwellings

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB1	Cllr John Scholey	Edenbridge and District Community Link	Support subject to changes	<p>* ADMP policy GB1(c) – does the reference to ‘outbuildings within 5m of the existing building’ mean outbuildings that are wholly or partly within 5m of the existing building?</p> <p>* Paragraph 5.20 – if a loft is</p>	<p>* Noted, policy GB1 does not require outbuildings to be wholly within 5m of the existing dwelling, only partly within 5m – no change.</p> <p>* Noted, however paragraph 5.20 addresses</p>

				converted to habitable space by the use of roof lights, will this floorspace form part of the floorspace of the 'original building' when calculating the 50% limit for future extensions?	this concern – no change.
GB12	Phil Aelen	DHA Planning	Support subject to changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* ADMP policy GB1 should be amended to delete criterion (c). The floorspace limit of 50% does not reflect the NPPF.</li> <li>* Supports ADMP policy GB4(b) and considers this policy wording should be used in policy GB1 as well, rather than reference to a floorspace limit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Noted, however policy GB1 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</li> <li>* Noted, however policies GB1 and GB4 have been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</li> </ul>
GB14	C Milligan	N/A	Support subject to changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Insufficient emphasis on design in ADMP policy GB4 – the document should include reference to design guidance e.g. the Kent Design Guide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Noted, however the SPD includes a section on design guidance, at chapter 11 – no change.</li> </ul>
GB20	Holly Ivaldi	Eynsford Parish Council	Support subject to changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Is newly created floorspace in the roof included in the total floorspace for future calculations? Would parish councils be sent plans of such applications for reference in assessing future applications in order to calculate cumulative increases?</li> <li>* Is newly created floorspace in the basement included in the total floorspace for future calculations? Would parish councils be sent plans of such applications for reference in assessing future applications in order to calculate cumulative increases?</li> <li>* Are granny annexe type developments included in the definition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Noted, however paragraph 5.20 addresses this concern. Parish councils will receive the plans that are applicable for the consideration of the planning application – no change.</li> <li>* Noted, however paragraph 5.26 addresses this concern. Parish councils will receive the plans that are applicable for the consideration of the planning application – no change.</li> <li>* Noted, a granny annexe is an outbuilding if it is a separate building to the main dwelling, and of</li> </ul>

				of 'outbuildings'?  * Strongly agree with paragraph 5.6.	an ancillary use – no change..  * Support noted – no change.
GB28	J L Phillips	Tandridge District Council	Support	<p>* Agrees with ADMP policy GB5 and considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p> <p>* Agrees with ADMP policy GB1 and considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p> <p>* Agrees with ADMP policy GB4 and considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p> <p>* Agrees with ADMP policy GB3 and considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p>	<p>* Support noted – no change.</p>

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB24	Holly Ivaldi	Eynsford Parish Council	Support	<p>* Typo in ADMP policy GB9(b) – ‘not’ used twice.</p> <p>* ADMP policy GB9(c) – would be clearer if the text said ‘use class’ rather than ‘use’.</p>	<p>* Noted, this is a typo in the reproduction of ADMP policy GB9. Amend criterion b):</p> <p>‘b) the design and volume of the proposed replacement building would not be <del>not</del> materially larger than the ‘original’ building...’</p> <p>* Noted, however policy GB9 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</p>
GB29	J L Phillips	Tandridge District Council	Support	<p>* Agrees with ADMP policy GB8 and considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p> <p>* Agrees with ADMP policy GB9 and considers that such development should not result in any adverse impact on the character of the openness of the countryside in Sevenoaks District adjoining the Tandridge/Sevenoaks boundary.</p>	<p>* Support noted – no change.</p> <p>* Support noted – no change.</p>

## Chapter 7 – Previously Developed Brownfield Site Redevelopment

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB2	Cllr John Scholey	Edenbridge and District Community	Support subject to changes	* Clarification sought on what (c) refers to in paragraph 7.4.	* Agree – amend paragraph 7.3 to replace the bullet points with small letters a), b) and c).

		Link			
GB4	Paul Carter	Paul Carter Planning	Object	* The document does not acknowledge that infilling may be acceptable and provides no guidance on how such proposals will be assessed.	* Agree in part – NPPF paragraph 89 considers exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Amend paragraph 7.2 for clarity:  <u>'Paragraph 89 (bullet 6) of the NPPF states that considers exemptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land)...'</u>
GB8	Mark Carter	Carter Planning Ltd	Support	* Supports chapter as it is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 89.	* Support noted – no change.
GB35	Craig Noel	Strutt & Parker LLP	Object	<p>* Chapter is too restrictive in respect of Green Belt PDL sites. In particular GB1 permits extensions by up to 50%, but there is no allowance for this in paragraph 7.3. The document should be silent on the interpretation of the NPPF or be re-drafted.</p> <p>* Concerns with the wording of paragraph 7.5 which suggests that the dispersal of buildings may have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. This is the reverse of the suggestion at paragraph 5.31 which states that 'clusters of buildings would have a more intrusive impact on the openness of the Green Belt'. Paragraph 7.5 should be deleted because it is inconsistent with paragraph 5.31.</p>	<p>* Noted, however policy GB1 has been found sound by the Planning Inspector – no change.</p> <p>* Noted, however paragraph 5.31 relates to residential outbuildings in the Green Belt and paragraph 7.5 relates to brownfield site redevelopment. The Council considers that both paragraphs are consistent with the respective parts of the NPPF – no change.</p>
GB36	Hannah Whitney	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Support subject to changes	* The document should include a list of the 4 major developed sites that are in the Green Belt, including the GSK site.	* Noted, however these sites are already listed in the Core Strategy and the Allocations and Development Management Plan. The Council

				<p>* Paragraph 7.3 should clarify how the Council will deal with applications for major developed sites in the Green Belt. The following text is suggested:</p> <p>'In line with the NPPF the Council will consider proposals for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of brownfield sites (including major developed sites in the Green Belt) based on whether they would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.'</p>	<p>considers it unnecessary to repeat them in the SPD – no change.</p> <p>* Noted, however paragraph 7.1 already references major developed sites in the Green Belt, and paragraph 7.3 sets out how the Council will consider proposals for these brownfield sites – no change.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## Chapter 11 – Design Guidance

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB37	Keith Nicholson	Kent Wildlife Trust	Support	<p>* Supports the document and particularly pleased to note the protection that is given to existing trees, shelterbelts and other biodiversity features.</p>	<p>* Support noted – no change.</p>

## Glossary

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB27	Y Tredoux	Kemsing Parish Council	Support	<p>* Clarity required for the term 'floorspace'.</p>	<p>* Agree – amend the Glossary to include the term 'floorspace':</p> <p><u>'Floorspace – Total floor area enclosed by the exterior walls of a building.'</u></p>

--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 2 – Practical Example of how the Council will determine an application against Policies GB1 and GB3: Limited Extensions or Outbuildings to Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB26	Holly Ivaldi	Eynsford Parish Council	Support	* Supports the approach which places responsibility onto the applicant for supplying measurements and calculations.	* Support noted – no change.

General Green Belt comments

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Company / Organisation	Support / Object	Summary of Comment	Officer Response
GB7	Mark Carter	Carter Planning Ltd	Support subject to changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Paragraph 2.5 should include reference to NPPF paragraph 54 relating to local needs housing on rural exception sites.</li> <li>* The document should set out the steps that are necessary to provide affordable housing as an exception site on the edge of a settlement in the Green Belt.</li> <li>* Welcomes the commitment to review the Green Belt boundary in the ADMP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Agree – this is a consequential change following an amendment to the ADMP. Amend paragraph 2.5 to include an additional bullet point:   <u>'local needs housing on rural exception sites in accordance with Core Strategy policy SP4.'</u> </li> <li>* Noted, however the SPD doesn't seek to cover rural exception sites. See Core Strategy policy SP4 – no change.</li> <li>* Support noted – no change.</li> </ul>
GB10	A Howells	Westerham Town Council	Support	No further comments received.	* Support noted – no change.
GB13	John Lister	Natural England	Support	* Supports the approach.	* Support noted – no change.

GB15	Alison De Jager	Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council	Support	No further comments received.	* Support noted – no change.
GB16	Kevin Bown	Highways Agency	Support	* Supports the approach.	* Support noted – no change.
GB42	Jennifer Bate	Kent Downs AONB Unit	Support subject to changes	* Concerns that there are no criteria based policies relating to the countryside and AONB other than those covered by the overarching Sustainability and Environment policies in the ADMP.	* Noted – this has been addressed by a modification to the ADMP – no change.