

Legend

-  Local Authority Boundaries
-  Tonbridge & Malling Green Belt
-  Settlements
-  Sub-areas for Assessment

0

160 m





Boundaries

The sub-area is bounded by the edge of the Plaxtol built-up area to the north, and a mature tree line to the north-east. The boundary follows the edge of an area of woodland to the south-east and south, follows a field boundary without significant physical features to the south-west and follows the edge of a further wooded area to the west. Inner boundaries: north-west. Outer boundaries: north-east, south-east, south, south-west, west.



Looking south-east from the northern boundary of the sub-area, showing a grassy field and allotments.



Looking south from the north-eastern boundary of the sub-area, showing allotments.



Looking west from the eastern corner of the sub-area, showing an open field bounded by mature tree lines.



Aerial photography used as a result of limited access to sub-area (Bing Maps, July 2025).

Assessment of sub-area against NPPF Purposes (a) - (d)**Sub-area Assessment Summary**

Sub-area scores	Purpose (a)		Purpose (b)	Purpose (c)	Purpose (d)
	Criterion (a)	Criterion (b)	0	4	0
	NO	0			

Purpose (a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

(a) Land parcel is located at the edge of a large built-up area	The sub-area is not at the edge of a large built-up area in physical or perceptual terms.
(b) Prevents the outward, irregular spread of a large built-up area and serves as a barrier at the edge of a large built-up area in the absence of another durable boundary	The sub-area does not meet purpose (a).

Purpose (b) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

Restricts development that would result in merging of or significant erosion of the gap between neighbouring built-up areas	Due to its distance from any relevant towns, the sub-area makes no discernible contribution to the separation of towns in physical or perceptual terms.
---	---

Purpose (c) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Protects the openness of the countryside and is least covered by development	The sub-area is not covered by any built form. The sub-area consists largely of an open field, with an area of allotments to the north-east. The managed nature of the allotments contributes to a more urban and less open character. There are minor urbanising influences from the presence of adjacent residential properties which overlook the sub-area due to its descending topography. Overall, the sub-area has a strongly rural character.
--	---

Purpose (d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Protects land which provides immediate and wider context for a historic place, including views and vistas between the place and surrounding countryside	The sub-area does not abut an identified historic town or provide views to a historic town and does not meet this purpose.
---	--

Summary of assessment of sub-area against NPPF purposes (a) - (d)

The sub-area meets the purposes strongly overall. The sub-area does not meet purposes (a), (b) or (d), but performs strongly against purpose (c).

Strategic Assessment

Stage 1 Parcel Scores (GBA) for parcel P16	Purpose (a)		Purpose (b)	Purpose (c)	Purpose (d)
	Criterion (a)	Criterion (b)	3	4	0
	NO	0			

Assessment of wider impact

At a more granular level, the sub-area performs similarly against purposes (a), (c) and (d), and performs more weakly against purpose (b) compared to the Stage 1 parcel, and performs. The sub-area plays a less important role against purpose (b) due to the smaller size of the sub-area compared to the larger Stage 1 parcel, which leads it to play a much less significant role in maintaining the gap between any two towns.

The sub-area does not adjoin any other sub-area, and is surrounded by the wider Green Belt to the north-east, south-east, south and west. The release of the sub-area in isolation would be an irregular extension of Plaxtol and would enclose areas of Green Belt to the north-east and north-west, diminishing their role in preventing sprawl and undermining the wider Green Belt's role with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The sub-area's removal would also impact the performance of the wider Green Belt to the south and west in preventing sprawl and maintaining openness as it would now be located on the settlement edge. Due to the strong visual barrier provided by areas of woodland to the south-east, south and west, urbanising influences resulting from the removal of the sub-area would have a reduced impact on the surrounding Green Belt and would not compromise the sense of openness of the countryside.

Summary of wider assessment

Overall, the sub-area plays a less important role with respect to the Stage 1 parcel, and its release in isolation is unlikely to significantly harm the performance of the wider Green Belt.

Boundary Assessment

Commentary on boundary features and impact on Green Belt boundary strength	The inner boundary is readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. The outer boundary is predominantly readily recognisable but is not necessarily likely to be permanent. If the sub-area was released, the new inner Green Belt boundary would not meet the NPPF definition. The new boundary would require strengthening.
--	--

Categorisation & Recommendation

Sub-area category & recommendation	The sub-area performs strongly against the NPPF purposes but makes a less important contribution to the wider Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration in isolation as RA-020
------------------------------------	--

Recommended Area Map

