

Call for Sites - 18th to 29th November 2019
Feedback - Sites Least Suitable for Development

COMMENTS	No. of responses
Productive arable land should not be used. With Brexit looming this country will need all the productive land to feed ourselves. Do we not already import approx 50% of foodstuffs?	1
None of the sites are suitable for housing development. The area around Marden has seen extensive housing development in the past few years. Further housing would be seriously damaging to the village especially in the following areas: (1) TRAFFIC is a real issue/problem; (2) PARKING is a real problem; SOCIAL INTEGRATION from the new/existing estates has been problematic; DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOUR around the village is now common place. MARDEN is a VILLAGE and if further development takes place it will become a TOWN. It does not have the infrastructure to be a town.	1
Left blank	2
97 - Flood Zone 1, 2 & 3 / 123 - Flood Zone 1 / 269 -Flood Zone 1 / 281 Flood Zone 3 and industrial area / 314 - Flood Zone 1	2
90 - Inappropriate for bottom of Howland Road to receive 40 houses and losing part of wood, Flood Zone? / 314 & 299 - Albion Road cannot take such traffic. Excessive number of houses.	1
226, 281 and 306 - According to Gov.uk flood website - Marden is High Risk Flood Zone. Government instructed MBC to build in Maidstone Town and Fridges - so why aren't they? Noise/pollution/safety/flooded roads increase of accidents/hospitals unable to cope.	1
281 & 269 - Flood plain - not suitable for housing but could be OK for commercial use. Not suitable for general housing but could support line work units	1

226, 281 and 306 - I can see no benefits building in much needed countryside - our climate requires urgent help. Capacity is being met - why is MBC not building on brown field sites? Flood Zone 3 - hot spot for these areas. Storms - wetter climate - reduction of wildlife as habitat removed. We already have issues with our current infrastructure - A229 unable to cope with speeding traffic that is regularly diverted due to water, gas escape and many accidents causing narrow lanes to become blocked as they are not designed for large quantity traffic caused by the chosen development. As a consequent historic buildings, habitat for livestock, wildlife, leisure pursuits are impacted. Our infrastructure cannot support the huge and increasing population. There are plenty of brown field sites suitable that would have far less impact on the environment within the Maidstone town to accommodate the population that require work. Kent was called a garden - why was it called a garden? A garden is usually land used for growing flowers, trees, shrubs and other plants. A typically and earthly paradise. Gardens are important for life!

1

We are already choking on the roads with fumes and congestion and parking is a nightmare. The countryside is suffering as the lanes built for horse and cart are used as rat runs and the wildlife is decreasing, this is of real concern as we have no right to take the habitat. Building needs to be in towns and on existing developments - not on flood plains. Who's going to pay for the sewage, drainage, expansion of roads and where are the jobs after the builds are complete? We are constantly becoming a city with noise, fumes and smell, the loss and effect on trees; noise and disturbance to us and most of all wildlife and the effect on historical buildings and conservation areas is truly worrying. We have real access problems as only single country lanes and unable to get help when there is an accident most vehicles can't get access and when the A229 is blocked due to accident, gas, water works etc. Safety is a real issue and of grave concern. What happens when these large lorries slip into ditches that are required to drain our clay soil. Where is all the water going to go as it is increasing especially after winters that are becoming worse due to climate change. We need farm land to feed us and wildlife and jobs need to be placed outside of the Southeast as we are already suffering. Also who is going to pay for the flooded homes, as building here will cause actually that? The financial costs to the damage incurred is of great economic impact. Pumping stations using electricity will be running constantly - so will us tax payers and the climate be paying for that too? Highways issues are already suffering as a consequence of builds in this rural area, the generation of traffic is already being a profound effect on free moving traffic as blockages on the high street, A229, single country lanes area having to suffer large vehicles and two way churning up the countryside and wildlife losing their habitat etc. With property owners access blocked and unable to leave as not able to cope and this is without even more - we are not a city - save our countryside.

1

The council of Maidstone Borough was asked by the government to supply housing that must meet flooding requirements Of what should be clear water, however pollution is of real concern to planet that is suffering from climate change of which continues unless we stop abusing our countryside of which wildlife is being greatly effected and the rural climate is confusing our crops and plants. We no longer seem to have seasons due to the constant building increasing pollution. Marden is in a flood zone area and foul sewage and drange is already real issues affecting and killing wildlife and getting into our water supply as it can't cope. The impact of climate change on ground water flooding is not known to increase the impact caused by this source of flooding. Climate change is effected to increase peak rainfall intensity - river flow. According to the government website Marden is of high risk of flooding increasing yearly to now 1 in 20 years - this is without new building developments. The government request was to build 10,080 homes by 2026 in urban Maidstone town centre and edge of - this is so they can walk to facilities and stop the impact on roads, car fumes etc of which is having extremely high impact on our climate affecting health to all. If we want to live in a city then we would purchase a house in one! As we wish to enjoy and care for our countryside enabling our planet to flourish for many years to be enjoyed by all helping wellbeing and wildlife is what should really matter - no wonder our society is on drugs and depressed as there is no escape of future rat race in the South East. Maidstone Borough Council, Marden Parish Council, Police and Highways are fully aware that when the A229 has a diversion which is the single track lanes can't cope Ambulance, Fire & Rescue unable to get through. Now Kent should be called a as no longer a garden to be enjoyed. Why isn't anyone challenging the government regarding the South East - it's not it's only option.

There are many factors as to why none of these sites are suitable, Marden does not have the infrastructure in which to support the huge population increase that comes with more housing. The station cannot take any more cars, the doctors is difficult enough to get an appointment now let alone with more residents. Most sites are also at huge risk of flood, in particular 226, 309 and 281 are all flood zones. You cannot build on these sites as the impact of surface run off from all the tarmac etc to Marden would be detrimental. You would be putting thousands of people and animals at risk if these developments were to go ahead. Site 226 is of a particular concern as the access to the land is NOT owned by the proposer. 226 also is home to many protected and endangered species, including cuckoos. The environmental impact of such a development would be catastrophic. Habitat loss, contribution to the extinction of many wild birds and mammals would be a direct consequence of building on ancient farmland. 226 is greenfield land and therefore needs to be preserved as such. Our country is becoming more and more in need of "at home" food/produce production especially in light of the concerns with Brexit, therefore to turn such a huge area of farming/agricultural land into a sole use site, such as housing, would be extremely irresponsible. The development of brownfield sites would be a far better socially/economically and environmentally idea. However these brownfield sites would need to be in areas that could cope with an increased population for which Marden can not. Marden is at great risk of becoming a flooding hotspot and following in the footsteps of Yalding, and more recently, Doncaster. You cannot build in a flood zone and get away with it. The impact would be absolutely shocking should development go ahead. The climate is changing and therefore this scale of building must not go ahead. As someone who wrote and researched a first class thesis into UK flooding and the impacts not only upon residents but the environment I urge you to look into more appropriate areas and leave Marden as it is. The fate of your current residents quite simply is in your hands.

226 and 306 are of concern as in Zone 3 many trees have been removed from the orchards of which soaked up the excessive water found in the Weald Clay. We urgently require more land to farm and more trees to be planted, also hedgerow/habitat for our decreasing wildlife. Sadly due to our hotter weather many animals suffer and wild birds are dying due to the lack of water. Sadly, also that food supply is being removed as development takes precedence. As our country suffers further disruption in the years to come due to us causing and not prevently further harm to our plant, we will need as much land as possible enabling us to move crop growing to where possible and our live stock. Building homes for our increasing population and decreasing wildlife is of grave concern. Investigations into appropriate building land should be assigned to existing brownfield sites especially given the climate changes. Also, we have no idea how Brexit will affect our agricultural land nor how much we can expect other countries to supply due to their actions and what the climate allows them to grow. Also at what cost? What cost to the planet? What cost to us as the tax payer? What cost to the wildlife? What cost to our generation and future generation - we need to solve land, plant trees, care for historical land and building. Reduce pollution, noise or disturbance to wildlife. Stop building more developments that require a car, transport should be limited for food distribution otherwise warehouse will be required too.

1

Frequent storms, intense rainfall leads to build up of water - these areas are particularly vulnerable: 226, 281 and 309 - Flood Zone 3 / Urban areas are susceptible to flooding - these areas already flood - who is going to sort the mess when it happens? Too late for the dead, too late for loss and harm caused by MBC. We no longer have all year turn out for our animals due to the wet weather - seasons no longer happen. Due to the increase in traffic I have had to purchase a horsebox and drive to places enabling us to ride as our country roads built for the horse/cart/mans feet are no longer an option! So now I am adding the climate change and suffering from mental health problems like others as a consequence of MPs, Councillors and Government.

1

<p>309 - I understand that this proposes the "Garden Village" concept which cannot be supported by the present infrastructure and would fundamentally change and distort the culture of the existing village / 318 - judging by the area shown on the plan a large number of dwellings would be involved and this is wholly inappropriate because of the poor road network and detachment from existing village / 90 - This is on a dangerous road stretching the village envelope further stressing infrastructure / 97 - clearly a flood risk / 226 - Again as in 309 the scale is far too large and would open the door to Marden and Staplehurst being joined up.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Any site which is productive, arable land. What is the point of building houses if the residents have no bread to eat? We need our farm land. I would like to see farmers farming and not trying to make money from selling their land.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - Adding such a large development only a rural village with poor transport links / 90, 295 & 314 - more houses on this dangerous road - unsuitable - facilities stretched further / 226 - very large development. Transport and infrastructure in both villages inadequate</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>I am afraid that I do not support further development in Marden than the odd "in fill" for the following reasons and these have been consistent in all my other feedback: we do not have the infrastructure to support any more traffic; flood risk - we already have areas that do not even dry out in Summer now; additional pressure on the rail network; my main reason is that there are many brown field sites and redundant buildings within local towns which should be developed first; once we have lost our beautiful countryside it is gone forever and we have many rare species residing in the area; there is already a large number of unsold houses so I believe we are reaching saturation point; the "village" feel will be lost with more and more commuters just using the area to sleep in. They have minimal contact with the village and do not get involved.</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>226, 309 and 281 - Flood Zone 3. Building here will only exacerbate the existing flooding issues. Rainfall set to rise by 40% due to climate. Greenbelt land should remain as such - Maidstone Council needs to work within their guidelines and not build on flood plains. Our country lanes are already choking and become grid locked as most single lane as not built for motorised traffic. The A229 is currently also unable to cope, and many of us are blocked into our homes due to the diversions, accidents, gas and water leaks. No help can get to us and my husband has suffered three heart attacks and has been diverted from nearby hospitals unable to cope with our existing population. Due to speeding vehicles delivering and driving to work countryside walks, horse riding and cycling are no longer an option. Wildlife, fumes, noise, parking, no transport, rail links are of only going to increase our already overstretched Marden. We already have a large number of properties built in Marden with neighbour villages, Staplehurst and Headcorn, with massive impacting development - I expect will see a motorway next to accommodate all the vehicles that are causing damage to our plant - no one listening. Decline in pheasants, birds, rabbits , loss of grass during summer months, loss of use in winter months as sits in water. Cuckoos, buzzards, kestrels live in our greenbelt land - where are going to go when you build in their home? Where is all the water going to migrate to? Who is going to build sewers, drains? Who is going to ensure uncontaminated water? Who is going to pay for the damage caused to the land? Who is going to produce clean air?</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>281, 309, 318, 314 & 295 - Tarmacing and concreting over a flood plain can only be detrimental to the area. Local facilities and infrastructure cannot support this amount of housing (eg roads, drainage, water pressure already low in this area). The only road improvements will be junctions relevant to their development</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - Will destroy Marden as we know it, severe risk to both SSSIs and LNS sites. Loss of productive farms and traffic nightmares. Greatly increased risk of flooding, risk of social divide / 226 - Severe risk of flooding, pollution to the SSSI river. Will risk urbanisation in the area. Loss of habitat for wildlife and destruction of farmland / 318 - This site has nothing to recommend it - it is obviously a landowner having a punt. Out of scale and would massively damage both Marden and Staplehurst / 286 - No justification for further development so far out of village envelope, traffic issues / 281 - too large</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>309, 226, 318 & 281 - all too big, infrastructure cannot cope. Already we have traffic jams in Marden and surrounding villages, trains to London at full capacity, electricity voltage drops and power surges, very low water pressure. Raw sewage in Beult and Teise. Marden Medical Centre struggling with high patient numbers. No affordable housing for local people - London Boroughs are buying many of the new houses / 286 - outside village envelope</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>54, 123, 96 & 97 - impact on habitat and infrastructure, increase in road traffic, when local rivers are in flood Chainhurst is inaccessible by road as deep water flows over access roads in all direction (ie Hunton Road, Green Lane and Underlyn Lane) / 309 - high impact on road network, A229, Maidstone etc high impact on ecology and habitat.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - impact on road network. Impact on ecology and habitat / 54 & 123 - Chainhurst inaccessible by road when surrounding rivers flood. Impact on habitat and infrastructure / 96 & 97 - inaccessible by road during flooding</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>281, 309, 318 ,314 & 295 - Building and developing on a flood plain can only be devastating for the area, with possible threats to Marden village. The local infrastructure will not support this amount of development. Roads, schools, health facilities, drainage and pressure of water which is already low in this area</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>All of them because the infrastructure and services cannot support more.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>At this moment I believe there are zero sites suitable for the type of proposals that any of the developers are putting forward. None of the proposals allow for suitable quantities of affordable housing and social housing. The proposals are made up of larger expensive housing units that do not cater for younger, semi-professional, manual labour workers who currently live in the Weald area. All/any plans must include 1 bed flats, 2 bed flats, 2 bed houses and upwards to be inclusive. Because they will more likely be working locally more adequate parking facilities MUST be planned in - min 2 spaces per property - IF THE/ ANY DEVELOPMENT GOES AHEAD. NB: We all know developers renege on plans for social housing and S106 monies when things get tight. Therefore developers MUST BE held to a pre-build arrangement on their "upfront" marketing ploys/promises, ie funding for schools, medical, roads etc. Plus plans for funding during and 10 years after completion.</p>	<p>1</p>

None of the existing roads, drainage, schooling or doctors can cope ' far too many vehicles and lorries on all roads. All the larger sites on farming sites. A few years ago one would never have any development on farming land. Keep our village as a village. This is completely mad what are the local and county councils - must be quite crazy. Please keep our villages and build on brownfield sites.	1
226 - situated in flood zone 3 and water flows to SSSI River Beult. Protected birds species around area. Shame to ruin environmental schemes it has belonged to for 15 years / 309 & 318	1
309 - too large for the existing community and infrastructure / 295 - Copper Lane is not suitable for increased traffic on a two way basis / 269 - flood zone / 318 - too large for the existing community and infrastructure / 314 - flood zone	1
226 - relies on car use / 309 - will ruin Marden village / 318 - connects Marden and Staplehurst	1
Increase in traffic on country roads and through narrow village centre. Increase in public train and bus services which run at full capacity already with no scope for increase in services. GP practice at capacity - no room for expansion - difficult for current population to get appointments with more housing still to come. Primary school close to capacity. Transport to secondary schools at capacity. Flood zone risks - increased by recent building over land that would previously have drained	1
309 - pure greed / 318 - Marden and Staplehurst will meet / 226 - remote so not environmentally friendly	1
309 - too many houses and north of railway / 226 - too big, unsustainable and flooding / 318 - too big and merges us with Staplehurst	1
309 - oversized	1
318, 309 & 226 -all too large	2
309, 318 & 226 - the size of these three sites would put too much pressure on infrastructure that is already under strain	1
309 & 226 - too big and spoil the countryside	1

309 - totally unsuitable for the rural environment of MPC. It would fracture the community and add substantial pressure on an already creaking infrastructure / 295 - Copper Lane is totally unsuitable for 2-way traffic and traffic of an increased volume / 269 - flood zone, application already refused / 318 - too large for the rural location, infrastructure in that area unsuitable to absorb such a development / 314 - flood zone, will add additional pressure on environment and infrastructure on top of the Russet Grove development	1
309 - avoid development north of rail line / 226 - this site floods / 281 & 31 - north of railway line, flood risk	1
309, 269, 295, 09 & 226 - too big and spoils the countryside	1
All of them	3
309, 226 & 318 - ridiculously large proposed site	1
309 - Firmin has ruined Marden by building north of the railway / 318 - countryside damage / 226 - Marden can take no more development	1
All of them are ridiculous. No more in Marden - listen to your residents	1
All - Marden is full	1
All of them. I have lived in Marden for 38 years and it is too busy	1
309 - Firmin's abhorrent masterplan - see MPOG Technical document. 309, 318 & 226 - the impact on countryside, pollution, traffic congestion, decreased green fields. Marden cannot take any more housing. Flooding	1
309 - MPOG Technical document. 5000 petition. 2000 march. NO / 318 & 226 - Marden is full	1
226 - A229 is a dangerous road with lots of fatal crashes / 309, 318	1
226 - Already floods and the road isn't coping. It is well used agricultural land. The A229 is already dangerous with numerous deaths, no more congestion needed / 309, 318	1
226 - A229 is a dangerous road / 309, 318	1
226 - This land includes some in flood zone 3 and is well used agricultural land which would be a disaster to lose. There is already ancient woodland in and around this site / 309, 318	1

226 - often floods on an already extremely dangerous road. Numerous deaths. Protected bird species on this site (already endangered) / 309, 318	1
226 - the site is in flood zone 3. Protected species of birds. Unsuitable for a big site in open countryside / 309, 318	1
226 - this area is in risk of serious flooding (flood zone 3). There is also old woodlands around this site / 318, 309	2
226 - Flood zone 3. It's too big a site for the open countryside. There are many protected birds living near the site / 309, 318	1
309 - Please see MPOG technical document / 309, 318 & 226 - Negative impact on the amenities of the area, Marden cannot take more traffic. Destroying biodiversity, ruining the vernacular of the countryside. These vast developments ALL exceed the 198 limit for building and will change Marden from a self-contained village to a sprawling town. Marden has already recently absorbed 600 houses. NOTHING should be built North of the Railway! The MPC <u>should</u> have included this in our neighbourhood plan as discussed at meetings on 3 occasions! We do NOT want 14 years of building, pollution and gridlock on the roads	1
226 - in flood zone 3, not appropriate. A229 already a dangerous road and not suitable for development. Additionally ancient woodland site / 309, 318	1
226 - often floods already. A229 is a dangerous road / 309, 318	1
226 - protected bird species are known to reside in near proximity to this site. Site has been in environmental scheme for the last 15 years - shame to ruin all good work / 309, 318	1
226 - Land is in flood zone 3. What a shame to waste all the good work the environmental scheme was done over the last 15 years. This is well used agricultural land - arable. The site is a long way from amenities which means yet more traffic on the road. A229 is a dangerous road. There have been a number of fatal crashes. Water flows directly from SSSI. Protected bird species reside in near proximity to the site. Ancient woodland is in and around the site / 309, 318	1
226 - It is on top of the A229 at a location that already suffers with serious/fatal road traffic collisions and heavy traffic for a single carriageway. This road will not cope with the extra traffic from development. This is well used agricultural land which we shouldn't lose / 309, 318	1
226 - part of site is in flood zone 3 and has flooded. Water flows direct from site to SSSI. Protected birds live on and near site / 309, 318	1

226 - some of the site is in flood zone 3. Water flows directly from site to SSSI / 309, 318	1
281 - No development should be permitted north of the railway / 194, 309 & 226 - highly unsuitable north of the railway / 119 - part of a large and unsuitable development	2
309, 226 & 318 - we already have 600 new homes representing a 37% increase in housing numbers. Marden does not have the infrastructure for more homes.	1
All of them not suitable - visitors from abroad, especially Americans and Canadians, love this area of Kent and come back frequently. They love the green fields and views, wildlife and trees, the local public houses in Marden and see it as quaint. They buy locally from us and buy presents from Marden to take back with them for relatives. We are in the Garden of England not the concrete jungle which it would become. Visitors live this part of Kent as it is now. Why destroy a green and fertile land. Save the planet - don't destroy it.,	1
All of them - Because almost all the surface water will end up in Yalding causing catastrophic problems. There are very few jobs locally meaning more traffic on the roads travelling to work. Because most of them are taking good land out of food protection for ever. Marden is not near any motorways meaning traffic congestion locally. Medical provision is under immense pressure even before the existing developments are inhabited.	1
318 - negative impact on traffic and amenities / 226 - negative impact to the countryside and biodiversity / 309 - see MPOG technical document	1
318, 226, 309, 281 & 295 - Negative impact on the amenities of the area. Roads can't cope with the extra traffic. Destroying our village and turning it into a town. Impacting on our countryside and biodiversity (so much for thinking about Kent as the Garden of England!). North of the Railway should be kept as a green belt! not turning us in a suburb of Maidstone. We have agreed already to 600 or over houses - enough is enough / 309 - see MPOG technical document	1
226, 309, 318 - destroying countryside - we are not a town	1
309 - too large / 318 - roads already gridlocked / 226 - ruins prime agricultural land / 295 & 314	1
318, 309, 226, 295 & 269 - will cause too much traffic, negative impact on animals and the countryside	1

<p>309, 226 & 318 - The natural wildlife habitat that the farmland provides, and beautiful views it affords, are intrinsic in Marden's rural setting. This would be lost to future generations forever. The development would increase pressure on infrastructure, create congestion, result in air pollution and impact railway services, sewerage and other utilities. Our roads are already clogged: 8-10,000 more car journeys a day would have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of residents. The village accepted a certain amount of development, evidenced by the construction of over 560 new houses since 2013. However plans on this massive scale are inappropriate for a historic Wealden village like Marden. It will become a town, and will lose its special character forever.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309, 226 & 318 - Negative impact on existing communities. We are a village. Impact on the countryside</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>None - I bought a house in a village not a town</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - Far too large for the village. Too many cars for very small country roads and access to other places / 226 - destruction of natural habitats. Roads to Maidstone already clogged / 90 - Howland Road is already congested and too small for further development / 318 - destruction of natural habitat and wildlife / 314 - habitats and lack of access</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - see MPOG technical document / 309, 318, 226 - adverse effect on amenity of area and countryside. Impact on Turtle Doves.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309, 318, 226 - see MPOG technical document / 281 - north of railway - NO / 295 - greenfield land</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>318, 309 & 226 - all these sites are ridiculously large, with negative impact (ie destroy) the village character, and simply cannot be supported by the present infrastructure. The road network around Marden can NEVER be capable of supporting such mass development</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>At the moment all are unsuitable. Marden cannot cope</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - Much too large, village cannot cope with 2000 more houses / 318 - too large, the village will no longer be a village but a small town which is not where we chose to live / 226 - too big, infrastructure can't cope / 90 - Howland Road is already a nightmare with the current housing and on street parking / 295 - Albion Road is too narrow for all the current new homes causing difficulties passing parked cars, more houses brings more congestion</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>309 & 318 - too large, Marden has already doubled in size over the past few years / 226 - too large. Infrastructure cannot cope / 90 - Howland Road is already blocked by traffic most days / 295 - Albion Road is already blocked by traffic most days</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>314 - Albion Road is already becoming really dangerous. No pavement on parts - puddles across a third of road. Cars hooting at each other when I parked along the road making passing difficult / 295 - Access to Copper Lane equally dangerous. Leading to more congestion in centre of village / 309 - This would split the village in 2. I would not walk to facilities there, causing more car traffic and I believe this will be the same for the opposite way. We have endured enough dirt and pollution, traffic and nuisance over the last few years / 194 - will this bring a lot more lorries on to our lanes. Don't understand what Community and Specialist housing is - so cannot comment. All large scale building will be onto roads which are VILLAGE roads. The route to Maidstone takes twice as long as it use to. The Wheatsheaf unction is supposedly one of the worse in the country for pollution. Routes to Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells use country lanes. How can these building companies promise better roads to Maidstone. So many of their pledges are not really in their remit. So much of this appears to be bribes to get their plans accepted. The wealthy landowners with London solicitors should not be allowed to manipulate councils against the good of our community. Flooding and drainage/sewage should/must be considered in view of climate change that is coming. Why are buildings not obliged to put solar panels on their houses?</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - Large scale development, irreparable damage to rural character of weald Kentish village / 226 - large scale development. Remote from rail link creating potential traffic, parking issues in village / 318 - large scale development on agricultural lane / 295 - medium sized development, impact on rural environment, extending village, potential to impact parking / 314 - medium sized development, impact on extension of village also flood risk</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>309 - large scale development, destroys the rural character of Marden / 226 & 318 - large scale development in open country, away from services, will cause major traffic and parking issues / 269 & 295- spread of the village into open country, medium size development, not relevant for Marden</p>	<p>1</p>
	<p>1</p>