

Call for Sites - 18th to 29th November 2019

Feedback - Sites most suitable for development and other comments

COMMENTS	No. of responses
None	5
Left blank	5
I do not wish to single out any particular site as I consider that Marden/Staplehurst cannot support (infrastructure) any more housing that is currently under construction. Having lived in this area for over half a century I find it sad that Marden is becoming an urban sprawl.	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
None - this is an impossible and unreasonable question to answer. We have not yet been provided with details about the proposals for each site. Any one of these sites could have a deleterious effect on the existing community and it's infrastructure but if viewed together the effect could be disastrous. By posing the question the implication is that Marden still has capacity to be development, my opinion is it does not. Surely the question should be "do you believe Marden has capacity to take any new developments?"	1
I believe Marden is at capacity and needs a period of "bedding in" and realisation of the S106 monies before any further development is considered, especially given period of climate emergency etc. In the future, I could only support small-scale developments (that would not have an impact on landscape) - so some of the small sites on Hunton Road etc, or village centre infilling - so some of the sites on Howland Road, Thorn Road, etc.	1
119 - Residential - is this old peoples home for Marden? <u>But</u> adjacent to 318 which is not suitable as it joins up Marden to Staplehurst - not ideal / 31 - Marden local housing only?? Good / 286 - Already employment for small businesses - encourage more / 269 - Second primary school and special needs? / 281 - Wheelbarrow Industrial site for Theatre/Events/Group and employment and car parking for events and station. Possible sponsorship from Opera/Theatre already storing.	1
None - Climate change/personal	1

<p>314, 295, 155, 111 and 90 - Suitable for small scale housing. Close to the existing settlement. No apparent site constraints. Natural expansion of the village / 74, 54, 304, 123, 213, 97 and 96 - Infill sites around Chainhurst, the Beech and Gatehouse Farm - suitable for small scale housing development / 286 - suitable for commercial development - expansion of existing use / 119 - suitable for five work units - not for general housing - too isolated / 194 - suitable for commercial use - expansion of existing industrial estate / 31 - suitable for housing - close to settlement.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>None - Marden does not have the capacity nor infrastructure to support such a large development. Even the smallest development would have a huge impact upon Marden. The developments that have already gone ahead have put a huge strain on the village. Roads are blocked, doctors impossible to get an appointment with etc.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>No one to date will take responsibility for the blocked country lanes that are not built for this amount and type of traffic - as the Police, Marden Parish Council, Maidstone Borough Council and Highways are fully aware. They do absolutely nothing to resolve any situation when the residents are blocked in their homes, also placed at risk from huge articulated lorries about to crush homes!!. Due to the many houses being built in and around Marden, I feel the countryside, wildlife and residents have suffered enough! I am astounded that MBC are quite happy to inflict further suffering to our already choking environment!</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Possible sites already at capacity</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>None are suitable - 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.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>I moved to this area to enjoy the Garden of Kent - little did I know MBC would allow abuse of power by requesting land used for much needed crops and wildlife? I found not of the sites suitable due to the number of rivers in the area of which is mainly High Risk Flooding! Weald Clay - there are no formal flood defences.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>286 & 194 - This is important to promote employment / 281 - on the basis that the housing element is relatively modest I would support this site because of the employment aspect / 314 - As an adjunct to existing new development I would not oppose this but on the basis that 295 and 269 are not accepted / 31 - this modest proposal would not appreciably increase traffic volume.</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>I am unable to suggest any sites which would be suitable. We moved here 31(51?) years ago and Marden was a delightful, rural village. It is this no longer. There is too much traffic, no suitable infrastructure and the village, in my opinion, has been ruined. I do not wish it to be spoiled even more. Therefore: no sites are suitable for development. There are too many already.</p>	<p>1</p>

286 - Small area for expansion of an industrial site that already exists / 8 - near Maidstone/Staplehurst road - provided only 5 units. In isolation not with 226 / 155 - very small expansion of existing business / 194 - Again would be small extension to industrial site for employment - parking for some cars near station? In isolation not with 309 / 281 - This would stretch Marden facilities further but would be acceptable if mostly employment.	1
8. 31, 74, 304 & 286 - smaller developments that will fit in with the village environment and enable the facilities already in place to cope with demand.	1
None of them because the infrastructure and services cannot support more.	1
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.	1
A229 is unable to cope with its current traffic. Upon accident and diverts for gas and water, ? The single track country lanes are blocked, verges used to try to widen roads and farms having to open fields allowing traffic to use their property enabling services and access - hand the residents of 31 & 54. When are stuck in this dangerous environment not opened up their properties the situation would remain unresolved as Highways, Councils, Police all pass the buck. Most unhelpful.	1
8, 31, 74, 304 & 286 - Small developments that will not have a massive impact on the area or facilities and in some cases provide employment	1
None of the sites appear to have much in their favour, as most area out of the village envelope or are disproportionately large. The larger schemes pose the highest risk to the amenities, utilities (water, flooding, electricity) and also to the social cohesion of the community	1
I consider none of the sites in Marden are suitable. They are either disproportionately large or outside the village envelope. Also like 2000 other people in Marden I am depressed and angry at the constant attack by developers with every new scheme reducing my quality of life and making my work in Marden more difficult.	1
194 & 286 - already industrial areas, more employment, low impact on transport network, low impact on community services, not in flood zone	1
194 & 286 - existing industrial area - increased employment, low impact on transport network (compared to housing)	1

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.	1
None - I am very much against any more development in the village or making the village very much bigger. There has been enough building already - quite ridiculous!	1
None - too much development already and road structure not acceptable	1
281 & 194 - offer job opportunities / 119, 54 & 97 - small and varied locations are easier to absorb in the community	1
I don't want to see any more development in Marden for the foreseeable future	1
Small 5-10 dwelling site - infill only. Slow growth - Marden has seen rapid growth - needs to adjust. Brownfield sites only - not green agricultural land. No to garden village - links to merge would in effect just increase village size	1
No more development please	2
None of them. Marden has had too much development over the past few years. Marden is a village and should stay a village	1
None Marden is already over-developed. Our services will not cope with more housing	1
Marden needs a break from new housing for at least the next ten years	1
74, 304 & 8 - small number of houses	1
111 - brownfield / 74 - only a few houses	1
281 - a provision of housing and employment should be of benefit to younger residents / 194 - employment opportunities for residents of the parish / 119, 54 & 97 - smaller housing developments in more diverse locations should help to alleviate pressures on the village.	1
111 - At least it's brownfield / 74 - small	1
A firm resounding NO from MPC will suffice. We should not have allowed Marden to have so much development. Especially losing the old cricket ground. Stand firm.	1
None are suitable - we have enough new houses in Marden already insufficient infrastructure, roads, services, sewage etc to support more homes	1
None of them - not even a single more one	1

Marden is completely full at present. You cannot park. You cannot move on the High Street at the moment. Marden Parish Council should say a firm NO to Maidstone Borough Council	1
None - Howland Road is saturated. The only possible exit would be more traffic towards Albion Road exit point but Countryside development has been horrific for the construction and road closures. As a family living in the west of Marden we cannot take anymore congestion	1
None of them - they are all constructed by greed	1
None - Marden is full. Marden Parish Council should align with it's residents	1
Marden has already had a huge increase in 6 housing developments. It is NOT a rural service centre by definition but a village. Huge opposition to any more development - 5000 signed petition; 2000 marched - Marden will strenuously oppose housing figures	1
None - already developed enough	1
None - the road infrastructure cannot take any more development	1
None - the countryside has been ruined enough already. The roads cannot cope already with the new sites that have already been built without anymore being considered	1
None - the countryside will be spoilt if more and more fields disappear	1
None of them - we are at maximum capacity already - more new builds would only add to current problems eg traffic	1
None - countryside will be ruined and infrastructure can't cope. Marden has already had numerous sites	1
none - too many sites already. Any sites being built would have to use existing schools/services. Roads wouldn't cope	1
None of them - Increase in already bad traffic; roads are in need of maintenance already and will not cope with extra traffic; services such as primary school, dentist, doctors surgery etc will not be able to cope with an increase of people	1
None - the road can't take anymore traffic!	1
None - the roads are bad enough as it is - the traffic is awful	1
No development beyond 198 houses - see MPC Local Plan. It is not for me to say which plots are most suitable, and they need assessing in accordance with the strict planning laws of ten years ago! That said, the call for sites should NOT allow building of large scale developments in Marden. The infrastructure is already at breaking point with the 600 houses already imposed on Marden. Max permission should not exceed 198 units.	1
None - too much development already	1
None - these sites will ruin the countryside vernacular. Road infrastructure can't take anymore development	1
None - the road infrastructure is unable to take any more development. The roads into Maidstone and beyond to the M20 are all too frequently at gridlock already. Further development would be catastrophic	1
None - Marden already has too much development with unoccupied/unsold properties	1

None - I live on the A229 and the roads are too busy. We will be going nowhere. There are already enough houses here and we have seen many car accidents	1
None - Marden already has 6 new sites	1
None - Marden is full	5
None - we already have 600 new homes - representing a 37% increase in housing numbers - Marden does not have the infrastructure for more homes	1
None - Marden has had around 600 houses built since 2013 - that's enough. Roads get gridlocked now in the area of Marden and roads out of Marden to Maidstone especially. Infrastructure not suitable for purpose now let alone future developments of mass housing. Services, ie water supply, drainage, broadband under strain now. Trains at capacity now - no room for an influx of more people. Drs surgery needs extension promised but not delivered	1
None - Marden has had enough new development. The traffic situation is terrible. The drainage system is outdated. The railways are at capacity. The services, ie water supply and broadband, are bad now	1
Current infrastructure cannot cope with the additional number of houses planned	1
We have already had enough development and further expansion will put a terrible strain on an already struggling infrastructure	1
We are full - no more development	1
We don't want building on our countryside. We already had a 37% housing increase in six years. No more development	1
We Say No	1
No more development - we've had enough. We've already had 37%	1
Small sites of 5- 10 properties may be acceptable especially low cost housing for the young	1
No more development - we are a village	1
We are a small village and have had our fair share of housing development over the last few years - put the burden of new development elsewhere	1
None - I feel there are no sites suitable for development in the Marden parish as we have already doubled in size over the last 5 years. The infrastructure cannot cope with anymore homes and the roads are already at capacity and deteriorating rapidly. There isn't enough parking at the station or library and commuters are parking outside residents' homes causing congestion and difficulties getting off drives. The school bus takes twice as long to get to and from Maidstone due to traffic all over the area.	1
I do not consider any more sites suitable for development. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more houses in and around the village. The roads are at capacity and are rapidly deteriorating. There is no parking in the village at peak times. Buses and trains are already full. Children are taking at least an hour to travel to school in Maidstone. The village has already doubled in size	1
8 - have never seen why this was turned down. Not much extra traffic and on main bus route. See no reason for other developments under 10 houses that are not on the flood plain should be refused	1

90 - accept the need for residential property, infill, no particular flood risk / 111 - small scale development / 304 - small scale development. Other - general accepting of business expansion if existing business model calls for growth and expansion. However not accepting of speculative development	1
74 - Marden has grown substantially in the last few years - only small scale development should be considered over the next 10 years / 111 - as 74 and not spreading into open country / 155 - small scale / 194 - should only be allowed if there is an identified need for small scale commercial development. All others are too large or inappropriate locations.	1
None - 198 in technical document for MPC. Decide those 198 by proper planning process, not by a random survey!	1
Marden is full! S106 is not the way to fund core services!	1
Too many sites - there should be a direct relationship between existing inhabitants and the proposed development. What about the infrastructure?	1
No development - we are not a town	1
<198 houses - see MPC Neighbourhood Plan. We are not a town!	1
None - I do not consider any of the sites to be suitable at all for development - through poor management and representation by MPC and MBC the village has already been catastrophically ruined of some of the history, great views and green land (not to mention trees) have been lost. It's time to realise that the village has enough and has done more than its fair share in terms of over development. Listen to your electorate! The roads are not suitable and main roads in village cannot be changed!	1
None - already too much development	1
None - the village doesn't have the suitable infrastructure to support any new housing developments. Developers are promising more buses/better transport etc yet they have no control over this. As we have seen with recent developers in the village these are all false promises. Our community has already suffered from large housing developments in recent years which has already shown negative impact - more traffic, not enough parking in car park, rise in anti-social behaviour.	1
No more housing - see MPOG Petition	1
None - Marden is full	1
No more houses!	1
We have had 600 houses already! A 37% increase in 6 years! No more development	1
Infrastructure cannot cope. No more development. Ruins vernacular of countryside	1
Marden is not suitable for large housing developments being in the countryside which should be preserved rather than turned into a concrete town	1
MPOG says NO to large scale development!	1
No more development. Had 37% increase in six years. No sites are suitable therefore under the "call for sites" umbrella	1

Any massive development will turn a country village into a suburban town and demands intensive infrastructure	1
37% increase already! See MPC Local Plan. No more than 198 houses	1
309 - New development needs to be north of the railway line to ensure the current Marden village does not become grid-locked and completely congested with traffic. The roads already in place, "Marden to Linton" road, would be better placed to take this capacity or be developed without bringing more traffic in to Marden village itself / 281 - access via Pattenden Lane taking traffic away from the village	1
We say No	1
194 - local employment / MPC has not been asked to add housing provision at village level so it shouldn't offer it up!	1
None - we as a village are at capacity	1
None beyond the 198 stipulated in the MPC Local Plan, which constitute the 198 is down to planners. Marden is NOT suitable for a garden community on a large site	1
None! - see MPOG petition. 37% increase already. S106 monies not allocated, ill thought out and not accountable	1