

## GREEN BELT ASSESSMENT

Planning Advisory Committee – 17 January 2017

Report of Chief Planning Officer

Status: For Consideration

Also considered by: Cabinet – 9 February 2016

Key Decision: No

**Executive Summary:** The Green Belt Assessment was commissioned to form part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan 2015-35. The Green Belt Assessment has been undertaken by Arup on behalf of the Council.

The Green Belt Assessment provides a comprehensive review of the performance of the District's green belt against the five green belt 'purposes', as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). All Green Belt performs to a greater or lesser extent. The Assessment categorises Green Belt as either strongly, moderately or weakly performing. Most of the Green Belt in the District is performing strongly. The Green Belt Assessment report provides a robust evidence base for its continued protection.

A very small number of weakly performing parcels have been identified, including sites like Sevenoaks/Greatness Quarry and the priority is to review these, and other brownfield sites in the Green Belt.

Separately, an analysis of statutory natural and historic environmental constraints and a landscape sensitivity assessment have been undertaken. The results of these separate assessments were overlaid with the NPPF assessment, which has led to the identification of parcels of land / sub-areas which are recommended by Arup for further consideration. At a future stage, further investigation and consultation will therefore be undertaken to determine which sites are to be taken forward into the Local Plan. In the meantime, these sites will not go out to public consultation.

---

**Portfolio Holder** Cllr Piper

**Contact Officer** Hannah Gooden, Planning Policy Team Leader, Ext. 7178

Recommendation to Planning Advisory Committee:

To support the following recommendations to Cabinet:

### **Recommendation to Cabinet:**

- a) To note the findings of the Green Belt Assessment; and
- b) To support the further consideration of 'brownfield' sites in the Green Belt and then, if necessary, the limited number of land parcels/sub-areas identified in the Arup report.

Reason for recommendation: In order to enable discussion and advise on progress with the evidence base documents which will inform the preparation of the new Local Plan 2015-35.

### **Introduction and Background**

1. This report provides an overview of the findings of an evidence base document which will help inform the production of the new Local Plan for the period 2015-35.
2. The Green Belt Assessment is a key evidence base document, which, together with other strands of evidence, will help the Council to protect the Green Belt. This Study has demonstrated clearly that the vast majority of the Green Belt (77 out of 101 Parcels) continues to perform one or more of these purposes strongly, while all parcels meet the purposes to a greater or lesser extent (para 2 on P.157 of the Arup report).

3. It will also assist in the development of strategic spatial options which will help towards meeting the needs of the District. This will include land for housing, employment, community facilities and infrastructure.
4. The Council is following a defined process to ensure that we arrive at a robust and deliverable housing target for the District – these steps were discussed and agreed by PAC in July 2015 (attached at Appendix A). This report considers step 4 (Assessment of Green Belt Options) and step 5 (other considerations). The previous steps involved understanding the need (through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or SHMA) and maximising the supply (through the call for sites and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment or SHLAA).
5. Before considering any Green Belt options, and as set out in national policy, brownfield land (both in and outside of settlement boundaries) will always be more preferable for development than utilising greenfield land, which is all Green Belt land within this District. Appendix B sets out 'brownfield' sites that have been submitted through the call for sites, which equates to approximately 40ha of land. Subject to their suitability, accessibility, sustainability and deliverability, brownfield land will always be considered before greenfield land. To assist in the identification and consideration of brownfield land, the Council is establishing a brownfield land register in 2017.
6. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the vast majority of sites submitted through the call for sites are greenfield sites located in the Green Belt.
7. It has been clearly and consistently stated that the preference is to focus development within existing settlements. As a result we have also interrogated:
  - potential for increased site densities as appropriate
  - under-utilised employment land
  - contribution of windfall
  - contribution of empty properties
  - contribution of office conversions under permitted development
  - Duty to Cooperate discussions with neighbouring authorities
8. In addition we are also reviewing our existing housing and employment land allocations, reviewing sites that featured in the 2008/09 SHLAA that have not been resubmitted or gained planning permission since, reviewing recent refused or withdrawn planning applications for 5 or more units, and investigating the properties currently on our Empty Properties Register.
9. In summary, Green Belt sites to be taken forward for consideration as part of the new Local Plan will initially be limited to sustainable brownfield land options, prior to more detailed interrogation, if necessary, of the other land parcels/sub-areas identified in the Arup report. Remaining Green Belt sites submitted through the 'call for sites' process are not likely to feature as options in the Local Plan consultation unless an 'exceptional circumstances' case can be made.

## **Green Belt Assessment - Overview**

10. Arup were appointed in August 2016 to carry out the green belt assessment. They are a multi-disciplinary consultancy, based in London, who specialise in this type of work. They have completed a number of recent Green Belt Assessments including for Runnymede, Buckinghamshire, Hertsmere, Uttlesford, Elmbridge, Hounslow, Dacorum, Barnsley and Cheshire East, which has recently been examined.
11. Their methodology aligns very closely to the five green belt purposes/functions, as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the way land performs against these purposes. To undertake the study, the whole district was split into land parcels and these were assessed against the five NPPF green belt 'purposes' outlined below, to identify the performance of different areas.
12. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states that the Green Belt serves five purposes:
  - To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
  - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict / other urban land.
13. The study provides strong evidence for justifying the retention of well performing Green Belt. Where it is demonstrated that the Green Belt continues to perform an important function, these areas are highly unlikely to be subject to any further consideration for release, except in exceptional circumstances. Further advice is being sought on the potential definition of these exceptional circumstances, as these are not defined in national planning policy or guidance. The Study will also help to identify if there are any areas of more weakly performing Green Belt land that could be considered further for potential development as part of a new Local Plan.

## **Green Belt Assessment – Background**

14. Sevenoaks District is 93% Green Belt, the authority with the third largest proportion of Green Belt in the country. Only the main settlements and larger villages in the District are inset from the Green Belt, with many smaller villages washed over by it.
15. The concept of Green Belt dates back to the origins of the modern British planning system and is frequently credited as one of the most notable achievements of the planning system, halting the outward ‘sprawl’ of London into the countryside. The Metropolitan Green Belt, first suggested by Raymond Unwin in 1933 as a green girdle and defined by Patrick Abercrombie in the Greater London Plan of 1944 (later established in the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947), curtailed the further unchecked growth of London’s urban area. Circular 42/55, released by the government in 1955, encouraged local authorities to establish their own Green Belts. The 1955 Circular set out three main functions of the Green Belt:

- To check the growth of large built-up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring settlements from merging into one another; and
- To preserve the special character of a town.

Circular 50/57, published in 1957, distinguished the inner and outer boundaries of Green Belts and established the importance of defined and detailed permanent boundaries. The 1958 Kent Development Plan and County Map provided the first designation of Green Belt in Sevenoaks District. The 1958 Plan and Map defined the Green Belt settlement boundary for Sevenoaks, Swanley and Hextable but did not extend into the southern and eastern parts of the District. The second iteration of the Plan and Map in 1967 extended the Green Belt boundary to include all of Sevenoaks District. Circular 14/84 was published in 1984 and introduced two additional Green Belt objectives:

- assisting in urban regeneration and
- safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The Circulars and policy statements (PPGs) were replaced in 2012 by the NPPF, which reiterated the functions and confirmed that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt was to prevent sprawl. There have been a number of minor amendments to the Sevenoaks District Green Belt, most recently in 2015 as part of the Allocations and Development Management Plan examination, but the extent of the Green Belt remains largely unchanged from its original designation in 1967.

## **Methodology – Land Parcels**

16. The key aim of the assessment is to provide a comprehensive Green Belt review of the District, assessing parcels of land against the five purposes of Green Belt designation. The methodology used to undertake this assessment is summarised below, but the full methodology is published online at: <http://www.sevenoaks.gov.uk/services/documents/housing/planning/planning-policy/new-local-plan-2015-35/green-belt-assessment-methodology>
17. The first step was to divide the entire District into parcels. Any potential alterations to the Green Belt must be based on a new permanent and defensible boundary; thus, permanent man-made

and natural features were used as the basis of criteria for the identification of the Green Belt Parcels. In particular, the boundaries of the Parcels were based on the following features

- Motorways;
- A and B Roads;
- Railway lines; and
- Rivers, brooks, and waterbodies

18. A productive duty to co-operate workshop was held with neighbouring authorities in autumn 2016 to discuss the draft methodology and land parcels. The methodology was considered by the neighbouring local planning authorities under the duty to co-operate and cross-boundary implications were discussed. It was agreed that land parcels would not overlap the District boundary. Parcel boundaries were reviewed on site visits and amended where appropriate, for example using additional durable boundary features if required such as prominent ridgelines or protected woodland edges. The assessment considered 101 parcels.

### **Methodology – Assessment against NPPF criteria - overview**

19. Site visits were undertaken to assess every parcel across the District. Each of the Green Belt parcels were assessed against the purposes of Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF. The purpose of the assessment was to establish any differentiation in terms of how the parcels in the Green Belt function and fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt. No national guidance exists which establishes exactly how such an assessment should be undertaken, but advice is provided by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) guidance and there are recent examples from other authorities.
20. For each purpose, one or more criteria have been developed using both qualitative and quantitative measures. A score out of five has been attributed for each criterion (0-weekly performing / 5-very strongly performing)
21. It is important to note that each of the NPPF purposes is considered equally significant, thus there is no weighting or aggregation of scores across the purposes. As such, a composite judgement is used to determine whether, overall, Green Belt parcels are meeting Green Belt purposes strongly or weakly.
22. A parcel fulfilling the criteria relatively weakly, weakly or very weakly (0-2) across all purposes is deemed to be weaker Green Belt. A parcel that scores 3 in any category is considered to be moderately performing Green Belt and a parcel that scores 4-5 in any category is considered to be strongly performing Green Belt. Where it is demonstrated that the Green Belt performs moderately or strongly, these areas are highly unlikely to be subject to any further consideration for release, except in exceptional circumstances. Areas that are considered to be weakly performing Green Belt are likely to be taken forward for further consideration in the Local Plan.
23. The assessment also considers smaller scale sub-areas within parcels which might be less sensitive and thus able to accommodate change. Therefore, although some parcels are performing strongly or moderately, there are smaller areas within them that are considered to be weakly performing Green Belt.

### **Purpose 1 – To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas**

24. The original strategic purpose of the Green Belt was to check the sprawl of London. However, it is recognised that the wider Green Belt also plays a role in preventing the unrestricted growth of other large settlements. Within Sevenoaks, large built-up areas for the purpose of this Assessment have been defined to correspond to the Tier 1 and 2 settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy set out in the Sevenoaks District Settlement Hierarchy 2015, namely Sevenoaks Urban Area and Swanley. The assessment considers the degree to which the parcel is contained by built-form and the nature of this physical containment and the extent to which the edge of the built up area has a strongly defined boundary.

## **Purpose 2 – To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another**

25. In addition to the clear function of this purpose in preventing towns from merging and therefore protecting existing gaps between towns, it also forms the basis for maintaining the existing settlement pattern. National policy provides no guidance over what might constitute 'towns' and whether this purpose should also take into consideration the gaps between smaller settlements.
26. Given that the Green Belt boundaries in Sevenoaks are in most cases drawn tightly to the defined settlements, the assessment of parcels considers gaps between all defined settlements (with Green Belt boundaries) in the District, as well as defined settlements in surrounding local authorities adjacent to the edge of the District.

## **Purpose 3 – To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment**

27. This purpose seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, or a gradual advancement of urbanising influences through physical development or land use change. The assessment considered openness and the extent to which the Green Belt can be characterised as 'countryside', thus resisting encroachment from development. Openness refers to the extent to which Green Belt land could be considered open from an absence of built development rather than from a landscape character perspective.
28. The percentage of built form within a parcel was calculated. Scores were then considered further in light of qualitative assessments of character, undertaken through site visits. This assessment considered the extent to which a parcel might be reasonably identified as 'countryside' / 'rural'. In order to differentiate between different areas, broad categorisation has been developed encompassing assessments of land use, morphology, context, scale and links to the wider Green Belt. These categorisations are: Strong unspoilt rural character, Largely rural character, Semi-urban character and Urban character, which are used together with the percentage of built form to determine the scoring.

## **Purpose 4 – To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns**

29. This purpose serves to protect the setting of historic settlements by retaining the surrounding open land or by retaining the landscape context for historic centres. The assessment of this purpose relates to very few settlements in practice, due largely to the pattern of modern development that often envelopes historic towns today.
30. Appropriate 'historic towns' have been identified through English Heritage's Extensive Urban Survey for Kent (2006), which identifies Sevenoaks, Westerham and Edenbridge. In addition, New Ash Green has been included in the assessment due to its unique historical identity (largely intact) as a prototype for a new way of living from the 1960s onwards. Otford was also included as it is defined in the settlement hierarchy as a 'local service centre' (together with Westerham and New Ash Green) and it has a historic core with linkages with the surrounding Green Belt
31. The assessment considers the role of the parcel in providing immediate context for the historic settlement (along the boundary between the settlement and the Green Belt) and the contribution of the parcel to views or vistas between the historic settlement and the surrounding countryside, looking both inwards and outwards where public viewpoints exist.

## **Purpose 5 - To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict/ other urban land**

32. Purpose 5 focuses on assisting urban regeneration through the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Advice from PAS suggests that the amount of land within urban areas that could be developed will already have been factored in before identifying Green Belt land. Therefore, assessment of Green Belt against this purpose will not enable a distinction between Green Belt Parcels as all Green Belt achieves the purpose to the same extent. Therefore an equal score is considered for all parcels in relation to this purpose. This is the approach taken in the majority of Green Belt assessments to date.

## **Methodology – Assessment against Local Considerations**

33. Following on from the assessment of parcels of land against the NPPF purposes, the parcels were then separately assessed against statutory natural and historic environmental constraints ('local considerations'). The Local Considerations fall into two categories:
34. Absolute constraints to potential future land use change, regardless of fulfilment of green belt purposes, which encompasses:
  - Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs),
  - Flood Plain (3b)
  - Scheduled Monuments
  - Nationally Registered Park or Garden
  - Ancient Woodland
35. Non-absolute constraints, which make a change of land-use less preferable, but would not preclude it completely, which encompasses:
  - Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
  - Agricultural Land Classification (Grades 1, 2, 3a)
  - Flood Plain (Zone 3a)
  - Conservation Areas
  - Local Wildlife sites
  - Areas of Archaeological Interest
  - Identified Open Space Sites
36. A series of maps have been produced to overlay these various constraints on the identified weakly performing Green Belt parcels and sub-areas to illustrate the extent of areas covered by absolute and non-absolute constraints and land with no constraints.

## **Methodology – Landscape Assessment**

37. The separate Landscape Assessment considers the sensitivity to change with regard to local landscape character of the identified parcels and sub-areas. This was undertaken in two stages:
  - High-level desk-top assessment of landscape GIS data and AONB management plans to identify constraint and opportunity
  - Fine-grain landscape and visual sensitivity analysis of the identified areas. The Landscape Assessment considers the sensitivity with regard to landscape character in terms of their ability to accommodate a change in land use if released from the Green Belt.
38. Field surveys were used to verify all collated information and include a comprehensive photographic record to illustrate each site. Detailed pro-formas were completed for each identified area, culminating in an assessment of landscape value, susceptibility and sensitivity for each site.

## **Findings**

39. The full Green Belt Assessment report is attached at Appendix 1.
40. The results of the NPPF purposes assessment have then been layered with the results of the separate constraints and landscape assessments.
  - NPPF five purposes assessment (chapter five of the Arup report)
  - Absolute/non-absolute constraints (chapter six of the Arup report)
  - Landscape assessments (chapter seven of the Arup report)
41. The areas recommended by Arup are set out at Table 5.2 (p.70) of the Arup report and a summary of the constraints and landscape sensitivity assessments for these recommended areas is set out at Table 10.1 (p.158).

42. Following the additional work needed to quantify sustainable Green Belt brownfield site options (not submitted through the call for sites), further work is needed to determine which of the areas recommended by Arup may potentially be put forward as site options, through the initial issues and options consultation for the Local Plan in 2017. Therefore, an assessment of the suitability and deliverability of these areas, in terms of availability, timeframe and sustainability (distance from town/village centres) will be undertaken, if necessary, to consider the likelihood of these areas being able to be taken forward. KCC will also provide a commentary on access and network capacity.

## **Conclusion**

43. It is notable that, nearly 50 years since the current extent of the Green Belt was established across the District, the Green Belt continues to play an important role in preventing the outward sprawl of Greater London and other large built-up areas within, and adjacent to, the District. It is also crucial for maintaining the District's settlement pattern, ensuring the continued openness of the countryside, and protecting the unique rural setting of historic towns. Clearly our Green Belt also protects the character of the District that our residents know and love.
44. This Study has demonstrated clearly that the vast majority of the Green Belt (77 out of 101 Parcels) continues to perform one or more of these purposes strongly, while all parcels meet the purposes to a greater or lesser extent.
45. The Green Belt Assessment report therefore provides a robust evidence base for its continued protection.

## **Other Options Considered and/or Rejected**

Preparation of a Local Plan is required by Government. The Council provided a commitment in 2014 (as part of the ADMP public examination) to review the Local Plan within five years. Not preparing a local plan will leave the Council vulnerable to unwanted planning applications and appeal decisions. Recent Government announcements also indicate that the Government will intervene to prepare plans where they are not being prepared in a timely manner locally.

## **Key Implications**

### **Financial**

Production of the Local Plan will be funded from the Local Plan reserve.

### **Legal Implications and Risk Assessment Statement.**

Preparation of a Local Plan is a statutory requirement. There are defined legal requirements that must be met in plan making which are considered when the plan is examined by a Government Planning Inspector. Risks associated with Local Plan making are set out in the Local Development Scheme.

### **Equality Assessment.**

Members are reminded of the requirement, under the Public Sector Equality Duty (section 149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and (iii) foster good relations between people from different groups. The preparation and adoption of a Local Plan will directly impact on end users. The impacts will be analysed via an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) to be prepared alongside each key stage of plan making.

## **Conclusions**

Preparation of a Local Plan is required by Government. This report provides an update on the Green Belt Assessment evidence base report.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix A** - Agreed process for addressing housing need in the Local Plan

## **Appendix B – Brownfield sites submitted in the call for sites**

### **Appendix 1 – Sevenoaks Green Belt Assessment (2017)**

#### **Background documents**

None

Richard Morris,  
Chief Planning Officer

#### **Appendix A**

Agreed process for addressing housing need in the Local Plan

##### **Step 1 Understanding Need**

Undertake Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Understand other adjacent authorities need via Duty to Cooperate discussions

##### **Step 2 Maximising supply**

Undertake Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) including a call for Sites

Explore potential for increased site densities

Explore potential for focussed increased site densities such as near railway stations

Assess quantum of under-utilised employment land

Assess potential contribution of windfalls

Assess potential contribution of empty properties

Assess potential contribution of office conversions

Discuss supply options in other authority areas under the Duty to Cooperate

Consider potential contribution of brownfield land

##### **Step 3 Understanding shortfall**

Match steps 1 and 2 findings for need and supply to understand level of any shortfall

##### **Step 4 Assessment of Green Belt Options**

Undertake full Green Belt Review of the District– assess parcels of land against the five purposes of Green Belt designation. Undertake detailed assessment at settlement boundaries and broad level assessment elsewhere

##### **Step 5 Other considerations**

Assess potential land options against other criteria, including:

Category 1 constraints (national/international) e.g. Green Belt, AONB, flood risk

Category 2 constraints (county/district) e.g. Conservation area, local wildlife sites

Landscape Character

Assessments undertaken in neighbouring authorities

##### **Step 6 Identification of land options for further consideration**

##### **Step 7 Housing target identified**

## **Appendix B – Brownfield sites submitted in the call for sites**

\*Please note that these sites have not been assessed in terms of their suitability, accessibility, sustainability or deliverability

‘Brownfield’ land, for the purposes of this report, is land that has been previously developed, without the exclusions stipulated in the framework (acknowledging that this does not replicate the definition in the NPPF)

‘Brownfield’ sites in the Green Belt (submitted through the call for sites) **Total:** 30ha

SHLAA site ref	Site address	Ward	Site size (Ha)
HO4	Harringtons Nursery, Highlands Hill, Swanley	Swanley White Oak	1.79
<b>HO22</b>	<b>Knocka Villa, Crow Drive, Halstead</b>	<b>Halstead, Knockholt &amp; Badgers Mount</b>	<b>0.35</b>
<b>HO24</b>	<b>Calcutta Club, London Road, Badgers Mount</b>	<b>Halstead, Knockholt &amp; Badgers Mount</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>HO25</b>	<b>Land at Polhill Business Centre, London Road, Badgers Mount</b>	<b>Halstead, Knockholt &amp; Badgers Mount</b>	<b>1.3</b>
HO45	Garages at Richards Close, Chiddingstone Causeway	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.05
HO48	Garages at Old Orchard, Charcott, Leigh	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.1
<b>HO49</b>	<b>Highfield Farm, Crow Drive, Halstead</b>	<b>Halstead, Knockholt &amp; Badgers Mount</b>	<b>0.69</b>
HO52	Chapel Wood Enterprises, Ash Road, Hartley	Hartley & Hodsoll Street	0.51
HO78	Florence Farm Mobile Home Park, Main Road, West Kingsdown	Fawkham & West Kingsdown	1
HO86	Chaucers of Sevenoaks, London Road, Dunton Green	Dunton Green & Riverhead	0.23
HO87 / MX9	Upper Hockenden Farm, Hockenden Lane, Swanley	Swanley St Mary's	2.36
HO99/ EM5	Sevenoaks Garden Centre, Main Road, Sundridge	Brasted, Chevening & Sundridge	1.82
HO104	Baldwins Yard, Noahs Ark, Kemsing	Kemsing	0.38
HO108	Redleaf Estate Yard, Camp Hill, Chiddingstone Causeway	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.14
HO109	Highways Depot, Tonbridge Road, Chiddingstone Causeway	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.21
HO115	Causeway House, Tonbridge Road, Chiddingstone Causeway	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.52
HO121	Land south of Morleys Road and west of the railway line, Sevenoaks Weald	Seal & Weald	0.58
HO124	Wested Farm, Eynsford Road, Crockenhill	Crockenhill & Well Hill	1.17
HO127	Gills Farm, Gills Road, South Darent	Farningham, Horton Kirby & South Darent	0.92
HO129	Terrys Lodge Farm, Terrys Lodge Road, Wrotham	Fawkham & West Kingsdown	0.45
HO132 / EM6 / MX14	Bartram Farm, Old Otford Road, Sevenoaks	Otford & Shoreham	1.24
HO143	Foxbury Farm, Stone Street, Seal	Seal & Weald	1.19
<b>HO150</b>	<b>Chelsfield Depot, Shacklands Road, Badgers Mount</b>	<b>Halstead, Knockholt &amp; Badgers Mount</b>	<b>4.86</b>
HO165	Fawkham Business Park, Fawkham Road, Fawkham	Fawkham & West Kingsdown	0.78
HO170	Land at Burton Avenue, Leigh	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.19
HO229	Land east of Fruiterers Cottages, Eynsford Road, Crockenhill	Crockenhill & Well Hill	0.11
EM2	Beechcroft Farm Industries, Chapel Wood	Ash & New Ash Green	1.49

	Road, New Ash Green		
EM3	Construction Yard, Main Road, Sundridge	Brasted, Chevening & Sundridge	1.59
EM12	Former Park and Ride, Otford Road, Sevenoaks	Sevenoaks Northern	1.25
EM13	Turvins Farm, Sundridge Road, Sundridge	Brasted, Chevening & Sundridge	0.93
MX2	Grange Park Farm, Manor Lane, Fawkham	Fawkham & West Kingsdown	0.68
MX12	Station Yard, Station Hill, Chiddingstone Causeway	Leigh & Chiddingstone Causeway	0.86