

Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC Response
42716289		0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	Recent Government direction has been to avoid as much as possible, development on Green-belt — especially in the overcrowded South East focus should be on brownfield and non green-belt	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new green belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
			Understanding the pressures that there is to create more housing in the borough, I do believe that customer choice and quality housing should be at the centre of the considerations. There is too much rushed through, poor quality housing that are designed the way developers want to create housing for saleability and profitability. We should push for more innovation, quality and community-led options. As a borough, TMBC could be known for this as more housing is rolled out. There should be options for cooperative housing developments like in Europe and many other countries. For multi home communities like cohousing where intentional communities are created with	Comment noted, in particular role of self and community builds.
38882465		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	1)	Comment noted.
38807553		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I agree in principle but you need to ringfence areas that will damage the environment either by building directly on them or by increasing pressure on	Comments noted.
42044577		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	The plan seems ill thought out in respect of Kings Hill with no care or concern to residents, only to developers. Attempting to wedge houses into protected green space along main roads is unacceptable and will leave vast	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42414401		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	It seems that regardless of any public discussion the go ahead is usually given.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through
42443265		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	The local plan also need to be mindful of existing residents needs and opinions - this needs to be formally stated and not assumed because a consultative document has been issued. People need to have trust in a plan	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42614913		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Although I realise that a Local Plan must be all encompassing to satisfy the parameters. I feel that this consultation is too complicated for many	Comment noted.
42180641		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I've come across this local plan fairly late in the day and there is an awful lot to digest. Any comments are likely to be parochial at this stage and I hope	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through
42778017		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Please remember that not everyone is able walk very far or to cycle. I am 88 years old and unsteady on my feet, needing the aid of a walking stick, but I	Comment noted.
42264929		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	am perfectly able to operate the controls of my car and this has been Fine words but can T&M explain how a 20m mast was erected at Wateringbury this year in the middle of a conservation area, in the middle of a 1066 Doomsday book Village without appropriate consultation!?	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
			The residents have spent a lot of time, effort and money improving the amenity of the cross roads, fought against section 106 plans to put additional lanes at the crossroads, in the centre of our Village, our community, for the authorities to build a 20m mast and accompanying cabinets right at the cross roads. I used to like living in T&M as I believed they respected the importance of maintaining and improving semi rural communities amenity. I do not believe that now.	
42745121		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	True	Comment noted.
38377665		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	In view of the significant and extensive content in this local plan, I think it will be important to share a further updated version for consultation	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through
42814561		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I trust the Council will take heed of all comments throughout the process so that the development of the local plan is a true democratic process.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through
25390689		0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	I am hoping that you will really listen to the people who actually care about where they live and this is not just a tick box exercise	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through
42687265		0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	I'd like to know why in such times we are making commitments to an 18	Comment noted.
42363585		0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		

42768321	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	The local plan is not for Ightham and the Borough of Tonbridge and Malling. In essence it is to meet politically set targets. The local plan should be for the local community and the local plan should be designed and written by the local community. The size of this document, the language used and the various links and offshoots make it at very best, unwieldy, but in reality, it is completely offputting and will deter MANY people from answering. Is this part of the strategy? Why can you not offer a simplified form? How can people who are not online or have even average literacy skills respond? What about those As I mentioned above, I look forward to seeing how those impacted by the plan get the opportunity to steer it.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42399553	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I fully accept that development has to take place in our borough, however home building up until now has mainly been focussed in the north of T&M and residents in these areas feel they have contributed enough - an opinion that I strongly agree with.	Comment noted.
42778017	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2		Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42423233	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		Comment noted.
42144545	0 1.7.1	it is essential to listen to with work with local communities which seems to be missing in national government policy	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42584097	0 1.7.1	It would help if they took notice of neighbourhoods It is very important to take into account all the views of everyone including all local communities when looking at the plan as strategic plans need to conserve our green belt, ANOB and village communities so that they can be conserved for future generations.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42633313	0 1.7.1		Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42715969	0 1.7.1	It's good that you want the involvement of local communities but will you listen to their fears and concerns?	Comment noted.
42440225	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	That's all fine.	Comment noted.
42822209	0 1.7.1	Local residents are as much, if not more, aware of the requirements for their area. When a large development is proposed, it should be mandatory for a proper formal consultation to be provided to all interested parties including local residents. Special weight should be given to comments from the residents as currently planning proposals appear to be pushed through irrespective of the feelings of the local community. As a resident of this borough for the past 15 years I agree that it is vital to be involved in the Local Plan as anything that is proposed will undoubtedly affect me and my community and we all need to play our part in helping to decide what will happen in the future.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42719265	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2		Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.

		1.1.4 - "It also needs to include strategic policies that address assessed development needs and respond to other local evidence."	
42443361	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Any strategic policies will need to be based on accurate information & the view of the local community fully considered. Currently, Appendix B appears to contain inaccurate & incomplete information. e.g currently it is not clear that "the Gallagher Homes Limited case established that when considering whether to alter the boundary of the Green Belt, the starting point for every local authority is that this decision should only arise after all reasonable and acceptable efforts have been taken to maximise the amount of development within the urban area"	Comment noted.
42781505	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	I 100% agree on the need for the widest possible involvement. It needs to ensure that the views of all kinds and classes of residents are properly and proportionately encompassed - and responses should be checked, and processes remedied as necessary, to ensure this is so.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42442561	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	no comment	Comment noted.
42806945	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	It is right and important that TMBC involves local people as much as possible, but there should be absolutely no assumption that residents in this part of the borough (or I suspect right across the borough) will have an 'ownership of the Plan' if it threatens or attempts to dilute the protective effect of the Green Belt and AONB. An understanding of the importance of the protection the Green Belt gives trumps any view that it could be chunked up and the protection removed in order to achieve the present housing target.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42833889	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	How will our comments here be translated into decision making process? This document and process is quite difficult to navigate, I fear that due to this it will not receive the right response as most people will be deterred from participating.	Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.
42444161	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	TMBC needs to retain the villages 'as villages'. Large housing developments will ensure we lose our villages and semi rural locations. Suburbia should remain in suburbia!	Comment noted.
42520801	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42520801	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Whilst i support development over the coming years this should not be to the detriment of villages being turned into housing estates.	Comment noted.
42530881	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Important to retain separate villages which retain own identities-don't want urban sprawl	Comment noted.
42536801	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	All are equally important.	Comment noted.

		<p>‘There will be an opportunity to comment on the Plan as it progresses to the more detailed stage. Further details on this Local Plan consultation and how you can take part are available on the council’s website 7 and within section 7.’</p> <p>This is misleading. There are no further opportunities stated in section 7 apart from consultation on the Reg.19 plan. The Reg. 19 plan is the document the Borough will want to submit for Examination. Any comments made on the Reg. 19 plan (based on recent experience in Tonbridge and Malling and the recent Leader’s comments) will only be considered at the Local Plan Examination by the Inspector. Giving evidence at the examination is time consuming and very challenging to non-professionals.</p> <p>Unless T&amp;M BC intends to do an interim consultation between Reg. 18 and Reg. 19 on which the community can comment on the proposed allocations and development management policies the first opportunity to do so will be through their District Councillors. The Agenda Item with the proposed Reg.19 plan will only be in the public domain 7 days ahead of the committee meeting determining whether it is the plan that should go out for public consultation. The public and Parish Councils will only have that window of less than 7 days to appraise their District Councillors of their views. Their own Ward Councillors may or may not be represented on the Committee approving the Reg. 19 plan. There are no questions in this Reg. 18 consultation that ask the public what their views are on development management (DM) policies, about HOW they see their communities changing and what they feel are important in the context of the allocations. Some of the questions raised in the Reg.18 do indirectly address the ‘how’ but only in a way that is mixed up with questions relating to the ‘where’ and/or what. Strong DM policies are vital to</p>	<p>Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement. There will now be a second round of Regulation 18 consultation.</p>
24986657	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2		
42559745	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I am shocked at the huge number of houses to be built with infrastructure already unable to cope. The loss of all green open spaces is appalling.	Comment noted.
42559809	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	is this the only space i get to comment?	Comment noted.
		<p>This is probably the worst constructed consultation I have ever seen. The council should provide sensible options, which also include sustainability impacts, transport issues, public services - the heirarchy of maximising brownfield, use of flats, meeting social housing needs etc. in a way that normal people in a normal day can respond. This mass of complex documents, hundreds of sites seem designed to ensure normal people cannot engage nor comment effectively. It is shameful that you have done so on something so important to the people of TMBC.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement. This matter will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.</p>
42197121	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
		<p>This section should also reference the UK Government's Net Zero strategy of 2021, which talks about the need for local government to take action, both on mitigation but also with respect to adaptation to climate change.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Further reference to climate chane and strategies will be made within the next Regulation 18 local plan.</p>
42587297	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3		
42584097	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Needs more consultation with residents affected by proposals	Comment noted.

42330433	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	Please elaborate on why the 2019 plan was withdrawn. Specifically can any of it be salvaged to accelerate this process and reduce the cost of developing a new one? What are the lessons learned? Which elements were good and should be carried forward (minimise spend on re-work)? What are the gaps / challenges to focus on addressing through this new effort?	Comment noted. Information on this can be found at this link: <a href="https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan">https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan</a>
42590561	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Where any steps taken to challenge the government imposed house building number bearing in mind 70% of the borough is in green belt> 1.2.2 what was the reasoning behind removal of the previous plan, how have you improved on it.	Comment noted. Comment noted. Information on this can be found at this link: <a href="https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan">https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan</a>
42641505	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	Do TMBC exist to provide a service for the existing local population or a potential population and house building companies?	Comment noted. Information on this can be found at this link: <a href="https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan">https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan</a>
42794625	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	This section gives no explanation for the withdrawal of the previous Plan. This omission means that it is difficult to comment positively on the requirement for a future Plan.	Comment noted. Information on this can be found at this link: <a href="https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan">https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan</a>
42444161	0 1.5.1	Where can justification for removing the original plans be found, what was the consultation on this and with whom did the decision lay?	Comment noted. Information on this can be found at this link: <a href="https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan">https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan</a>
42529089	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Understood	Comment noted.
42616033	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Generally the strategic policy does not address the lack of infrastructure and ignores local evidence of same.	Comment noted.
42470433	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	The local plan is making already built local homes worse and reducing quality of life for residents by building on beautiful green spaces where communities come together e.g. small green spaces on tower view in kings hill. These are a vital part of community life: children play games here, in the snow families sledge together here, people buy lunches from waitrose and sit on this green space and spend time relaxing or with friends. Your plans involve ruining these areas. I am for the building of new homes, but not at the detriment to current homes. Our home is one of those homes on the green and when we bought it, we called KCC and Liberty Trust to ask if they would ever build on that land to which they responded no they wouldn't, it was planned green space for communities to enjoy. You are taking away these spaces, planning to ruin communities and devalue homes.	Comment noted.

the following comments: Spatial Strategy Option

In my view, the north eastern area of the Borough has in recent years taken a disproportionately high volume of development which has placed an unacceptable strain on infrastructure and threatens to overwhelm small villages so that they are no longer seen as separate communities but are subsumed by urban sprawl. I think that TMBC should:

- a) adopt a spatial strategy that addresses this imbalance and does not continue to push development into an already constrained and overburdened area
- b) extend the Green Belt eastwards in order to ensure that the communities of East Malling, West Malling, Kings Hill and Leybourne remain separate and distinct communities.

Agricultural Land. TMBC must also address the issue of unsustainable loss of agricultural land which is a finite and irreplaceable resource. The first map and list below shows larger permissions that have been granted in and around East Malling in the last few years (this may not be exhaustive):

- 18/01013/OA Land East of King Hill West Malling 6.83
- 19/01814/OA Forty Acres - 18.17
- 18/03008/OA Site East of Clare Park, New Road 6.63
- 18/02966/OA Site South of Brampton Field - 11.58
- 19/00376/OAEA Land South West of London Road and West of Castor Park - 4
- 17/01595/OAEA Land South of London Road and East of Hermitage Lane - 34
- 20/02749/OAEA Land South of Barming Station - 14
- 20/01218/OA Land Adjacent Ditton Common North of Rede Wood Road Oakapple Lane - 5.7

100.91 hectares = 249.35 acres  
The word plan suggest huge development, in other words just an extension to grubby London. It would be nice if the word maintain or conserve was used instead. With landfill sites being returned to the rural status would be a step forward but I fear thousands of unaffordable new homes with the crime that comes with them.

All have equal importance

Comment noted. No decisions have yet been made on the spatial strategy which reflect national planning policy requirements, evidence base documents and other consultation responses.

Comment noted. Reference to character protection requirements noted.

Comment noted.

45651521 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

42438689 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

42633313 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

the consultation on the Reg 19 Local Plan will be sent by TMBC to the Planning Inspectorate and will not result in any changes being made to the Reg 19 document. I thought that the intention of the planning system was to ensure that local views were paramount (indeed, para 1.2.3 states that the production of the Local Plan will result in more democratic local control over the process), yet this process will suck decision-making up to the Planning Inspectorate instead. It seems illogical that there will be no opportunity to influence the content of the Local Plan after 3 November 2022 when it will not be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate until January 2024. I appreciate that TMBC have to adhere to a tight timetable to achieve this, but it seems to me that there are some key decisions which should be consulted on during the preparation of the Reg 19 document. At the briefing session on Monday 24th October, Matt Boughton said that Parishes would be closely involved as the process continues. The Reg 19 Local Plan will not all be written at one time, but will be the result of several iterations as more information becomes available. I would therefore like to suggest the following phased process could usefully involve Parishes if the relevant Borough Committees include the following information (as it becomes available) in their publicly available Agendas :

1. A list of the 291 sites with TMBC's assessment of which are deemed to be suitable and deliverable.
  2. TMBC's proposed spacial strategy.
  3. A list of sites which TMBC propose to be included in the Reg 19 document.
- All are equally important

It would appear the local plan is being influenced by business with no connection to the area. Proposing to build on the golf course for example without consultation to the land owner or golf club may be allowed but it ignores the very essence of Kings Hill, amenity requirements etc..

Comment noted. The consultation relates to an entirely new local plan which will be subject to future rounds of consultation, including a second round of Regulation 18 consultation. The withdrawal notice of the former proposed local plan can be found at this link:  
<https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/download/370/notice-of-withdrawal-of-local-plan> The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.

Comment noted.

Comment noted. The council has been seeking to engage with landowners of identified sites.

25349153 0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2  
 42637633 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

42442561 0 1.7.1

42442241	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The local plan is making already built local homes worse and reducing quality of life for residents by building on beautiful green spaces where communities come together e.g. small green spaces on tower view in Kings Hill. These are a vital part of community life: children play games here, in the snow families sledge together here, people buy lunches from waitrose and sit on this green space and spend time relaxing or with friends. Your plans involve ruining these areas. I am for the building of new homes, but not at the detriment to current homes. Our home is one of those homes on the green and when we bought it, we called KCC and Liberty Trust to ask if they would ever build on that land to which they responded no they wouldn't, it was designated green space for communities to enjoy. You are taking away these spaces, planning to ruin communities and devalue homes. You are destroying the essence of what Kings Hill sold itself on for decades. The 2013 Kings Hill promotional video called it "the UK's most successful new village". The virtues listed in that video are the reason for the success - reasons you are literally planning to bulldoze through.</p>	Comment noted.
42641505	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>1.1.3 - does the definition of "deliverable" come from hard data, eg something like what TMBC has delivered in the last decade?  1.1.4 - Does the "assessed development needs" include a quota for social housing and a specific clause stating that 5+ bed homes (mansions or other) are not to count towards this?  1.1.5 Viability through the document does not seem to include whether existing services are at capacity or open for business. GPs and schools, shops can be fully subscribed or at capacity. If that is the case then to provide housing will require new GPs, schools and shops in the existing locale which detrimentally affects the current businesses.</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance which includes guidance on delivery and viability.
42368129	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>What right has the Government telling us to destroy our beautiful green belt and historic villages to accommodate the vast number of homes it wishes to impose on us</p>	Comment noted.



examples from other authorities that viability does not need to be challenged by improved building standards. The viability study should test across a range of standards and include higher standards than those required by the current building regulations and also assess the impact of not requiring the highest standards of zero carbon.

4. Comment on para 1.6.2

'Active, on-going engagement with neighbouring councils is essential to address strategic matters that may have cross-boundary implications. This is because these matters do not stop at administrative boundaries;'

Has T&MBC had discussions regarding impact of climate change with KCC and neighbouring districts? If so what are the outcomes in relation to infrastructure, renewable energy, energy, Hydrogen gas availability and national grid capacity, and impact of development and building standards across the County on individual districts delivery of allocations (viability)? Is there a consensus on what standards to require to meet County and Districts' Climate change strategy targets? Has T&M been party to or initiated such discussions in order to drive improvements to building stock across the County? Other Districts have done this. Has Tonbridge and Malling? If so what are the outcomes and how are they informing policy?

4. Comments on Fig 1 – the influences on the plan.

Is climate change impact subsumed under 'Sustainability'? Should not meeting the Borough's Climate change strategy targets be a major influence? Every Option needs to be tested against its individual carbon footprint and its contribution to meeting the sustainability requirement (refer to para 8c, para 10.NPPF). The SA has insufficient evidence on which to answer these questions. In order to test options against their impact on climate change, carbon footprint, adaptation and mitigation the existing

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance which includes guidance on delivery and viability. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new climate change evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. This matter will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.

24986657

0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

questions posed in the Reg 18 LP, as well as further comments seeking to assist TMBC in delivering a “sound” Plan which addresses growth needs in full.

i) Duty to Cooperate

In accordance with the requirements of Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Guidance, the “Duty to Cooperate” (DtC) imposes a duty on authorities to cooperate with other planning authorities, the County Council and prescribed bodies or other persons by engaging constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to the preparation of a development

plan document so far as relating to a strategic matter to maximise the effectiveness of the activity of plan preparation.

The DtC relates to the preparation of the Plan itself and therefore cannot be rectified post - submission of a Plan. It will therefore be crucial TMBC demonstrates it has fully discharged its Duty, even more so in the context of the previous withdrawn Local Plan where TMBC failed to achieve this with Sevenoaks District Council.

The Reg 18 LP and its evidence base is silent on this requirement and does not address how this will be achieved through the Plan-making process. This is concerning, as the DtC process should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking onwards.

We are concerned TMBC is progressing work relating to strategic cross boundary matters independently to neighbouring authorities. One such example of this being the proposed changes to Housing Market Areas (as detailed in the Housing Market Delivery Study, July 2022) which appears to be completed unilaterally by TMBC, as opposed to in cooperation with other Tonbridge and Malling are being asked to provide an excessive number of houses each year. I agree that each borough should contribute but only in the context of the wider south east.

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance, and engages with its neighbouring authority and key stakeholders on a regular basis through the duty to cooperate. It is not always possible to jointly commission work but opportunities are fully explored.

Comment noted.

The local plan for this borough and, no doubt, many others is predicated on the idea that the housing need for the country should be evenly distributed amongst boroughs and around existing settlements. This strikes me as the opposite of the vision that existed in the 1940s to 1960s where a number of New Towns and New Cities were designated and built. Whilst not all can be considered a success, there are many that are and surely the greatest success has been Milton Keynes with an initial planned and realised population of 250k living in over 120k homes. As MK and the other new towns were planned by Development Corporations there was an inherent provision for all the infrastructure and amenities required, particularly on the new and rural sites. Naturally these avoided the Nimbyism associated with planning near established settlements and the inevitable drain on their already stretched resources.

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

44819617 42821281 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

38332545 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

42562465 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

			<p>The figure of 15,941 homes in the TMBC area is a ridiculous amount for TMBC to have to accommodate/assimilate. The NPPF states that areas liable to flood should be avoided as should The Green Belt/ANOB if our grandchildren are to breathe fresh air -The government should be using a different method of calculations and building homes away from the South East. TMBC like TWBC and SEVENOAKS have large areas ANOB/Greenbelt/ Flood Zone 3. These areas should not be built on in any of these boroughs and that is what the government says in the NPPF. I do not see how you can plan to build this number in the this area and function as a community so the government should rethink their numbers.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42684641	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5			
42716001	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Understood		<p>Comment noted.</p>
42716289	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		<p>Local plan must make protection of Green-belt a priority, and protect small local villages from mass development leading to loss of village status.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42762433	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		<p>Surely local residents are best placed to know what is best for the area in which they live. Why do we have government imposed regulations which take no account of local pressures? Where is the evidence that we need all these houses? The infrastructure is woefully inadequate not enough GPs and inadequate water, power and sewage disposal. This will become an urban jungle and not somewhere I would care to live.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42762433	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		<p>i understand that housing requirements are dictated by central government but I have seen no evidence to justify the construction of 839 houses per annum in a borough that is already over developed and whose infrastructure is wholly inadequate and cannot cope.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42718081	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		<p>That all sounds correct</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Developments Ltd in response to Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council's Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation. These representations in particular concern a Site at Postern Quarry, Postern Lane, Tonbridge. 1.2 The Site at Postern Lane was submitted as part of the previous Call for Sites exercise in February 2022 (site reference 59834) for redevelopment for a leisure lead development incorporating water based uses together with significant areas of public open space, woodland, community uses and a new marina. Approximately 500no. new homes are proposed towards the western end of the site (adjacent to Tonbridge) as a mix of terraced, semidetached and detached homes providing a policy compliant level of affordable housing.

1.3 Notwithstanding our Client's specific land interests, these representations have been prepared in objective terms and assessed against the prevailing planning policy framework, in particular the Government's guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (March 2014 as updated). 1.4 The purpose of the Planning System is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. As such, NPPF para 11 requires plans to apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development which for plan making means that : (a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to meet the development needs of their area, align growth and infrastructure, improve the environment, mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects.

1.5 More specifically, the Draft Local Plan has been reviewed in the context of para 35 of the NPPF, which requires that, Local plans and spatial development strategies are examined to assess whether they have been

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

43072865 42278305 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

Regulation 18 Local Plan, having taken into consideration relevant documents from the evidence base. 3.2 In summary, we support the preparation of a new Local Plan for TMBC and set out our recommendations for the form and content of the new Local Plan as it progresses to Regulation 19 stage. 3.3 The recommendations below have been made with a view to ensuring the new Local Plan is 'sound'. We consider it important that our recommendations are picked up now, given the ability to alter strategic policies narrows as the Local Plan progresses towards submission. 3.4 To assist with the consideration of our representations, we have benchmarked our recommendations in the context of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') [adopted in July 2021]. 3.5 Para. 11 of the NPPF – namely, the presumption in favour of sustainable development – in relation to plan-making requires plans to “positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change” and that “strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas” (unless the application of policies within the NPPF, or any adverse impacts would allow doing so). 3.6 Although Para. 35 of the NPPF relates to Regulation 19 Local Plans, requiring any Local Plan submitted to the Secretary of State for examination to be capable of being found both legally compliant and sound by ensuring the Plan meets the below criteria, we consider it appropriate to bear these requirements in mind at Regulation 18 stage.

- Positively prepared – Providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs and is informed by agreements

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

44336545 42807969 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

			<p>Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and Sevenoaks District Council, linking the edges of Kemsing in the west with the edges of Wrotham in the east. The estate also touches West Kingsdown in the north and directly adjoins Kemsing station in the south. 1.2 St Clere supports a range of key local functions; it's a farm and forestry business, it hosts a range of events, and crucially provides commercial employment space and housing across its estate. 1.3 The Estate turns 400 years old in 2030 and is actively working to diversify its activities in light of changes to the agricultural sector. The estate also wants to move towards a sustainable model of operating and this will include creating more housing opportunities for its staff, given that it is a significant rural employer. St Clere is ambitious; determined to preserve its heritage assets, support the local economy and benefit the local community, the Estate is seeking support of the</p> <p>Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan to respond to its needs. 1.4 St Clere fully supports each of the Plan's goals, including backing local business, delivering new homes and supporting active travel. It is appreciated that the rural character of the Borough is referred to in the Consultation Document and evidence base, especially in relation to the rural economy, and St Clere welcomes the fuller progression of these themes within future iterations of the Plan.</p> <p>1.5 This representation offers a holistic response to the Consultation Document, focusing in on the Strategic Matters, Housing, Economic Development and Transport sections (5.1, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 respectively) as a framework for our response, with a summary of our Call-for-Sites submissions. 2.0 Strategic Matters: Rural Planning (Section 5.1)</p> <p>2.1 A nuanced approach to Rural Planning is extremely important in supporting effective development in rural areas. Estates such as St Clere are</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
44345345	44345409	1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42721089	0	1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42616033	0	1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>Government accept the top down approach currently adopted does not work and needs to be changed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42715969	0	1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>I understand the need for a plan and that houses need to be built but why does it have to be so many new homes in the same area</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42722721	0	1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Place where all can enjoy the remaining countryside</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42806945	0	1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>I understand that we do need a new Local Plan. However with the present unknowability of the direction of the present National Government, with its stated intention to review all policies, and the certainty of a General Election in around 2 years' time with further uncertainties as to policy direction, TMBC should follow the practice of many other Councils (all in the same position as TMBC) and delay the Local Plan process. This is on the assumption that the present strong presumption against development in the Green Belt and in the AONB will remain for the delayed period.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42584097	0	1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The government just overturn everything local government should stick to what is agreed locally</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42726689	0	1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>All are equally important</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

42730209	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The original vision for Kings Hill was that the old airfield should be developed as a place where people could live and work. This is consistent with the stated objectives for the new local plan. There were to be open spaces and leisure facilities. The area is now already over-developed and facilities cannot cope with the existing number of residents. Part of the business area is now being developed to provide additional housing. This already undermines the original vision, which was developed in conjunction with Kent County Council. What was agreed in the original plans should be protected. The surrounding green areas should be preserved. Kings Hill, West Malling and East Malling should maintain their individual communities rather than becoming one big urban sprawl with no identity.</p>	Comment noted.
42641761	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The Government should be asked to provide evidence of the level of housing need in the TMBC area, as only 1500 persons are currently on the TMBC waiting list.</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42751073	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>This is too complicated for the ordinary lay person to comment on sensibly.</p>	Comment noted.
42684641	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The government expect too many homes in this area with the land limitations if they require safe deliverable homes.</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42716705	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The expectations of a recently formed conservative government are not yet (late October 2022) fully developed or understood. However, we already hear that brown field sites should be a priority for residential development. Additionally, we believe that government policy is likely to demand that agricultural land should be retained for food production. We would also point out that a key element of conservative policy, as explicitly stated by David Cameron, is to ensure that the people of this country retain a choice as to the type of environments in which to live, be it urban or rural. It must be remembered that quality of life is more important than standard of living and that environment is a key component of quality of life. It is not surprising, therefore, that many, like us, who have chosen to live in a predominantly rural area feel threatened by the huge swathe of development that has recently engulfed the Malling part of the borough and which will, if not checked, completely destroy the rural aspect we have chosen. There is a grave threat that the local villages will soon lose their individual identities and character.</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42718497	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The housing targets should be set by the Local Council with regard to how much capacity is available in Brownfield sites. No house building should take place on green field areas.</p>	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

42736321	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	Will the Plan take into account the public commitment from Secretary of State for DLUHC (BBC interview with Laura Kussenberg 30 October) - that his policy for new developments should be “more beautiful”, have the consent of the local community, be accompanied by the right infrastructure and protect the environment? These appear to be the overarching aims of the Government and clearly the consent of the local community is a significant factor for many of the proposed sites in the middle of existing villages and towns. Thank you.	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42800033	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	How does the government assess the housing strategy for all boroughs? How can they possibly decide how local demographics should be played out when the influx of illegal immigrants alone totally disrupts housing lists and true local needs. An algorithm cannot be applied to decide something as important as this. Nor should a bean counter in Westminster decide what we need in TMBC The 40 year plan is a huge emotional disappointment. I moved to Ightham because of its quietness. It is nationally recognised for its high quality, community and housing. Are your plans going to raise the quality of life for me as a resident of Ightham? Or are you going to cause long term upset maybe lasting 20 years and change the current desirable way of life? This area needs protection and stay as it is. Worse case scenario is to change it and spoil it forever for those that live here and its attractiveness to all of its visitors.	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.  Comment noted.
42768321	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42800865	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	The government has unrealistic expectations for a borough which is 70% green belt. The data is old (2014) and should be refreshed. It is also looking too far ahead bearing in mind the fluctuating economic situation  What are the expectations of the Government? Who knows!  We are now onto a new Prime Minister who appears to have more sense than the last one as I believe he is committed to a brownfield first policy. I quote Tom Fyans interim CE of CPRE who states “with an escalating food, energy and climate crisis, we need to get smart about how we use our land”.	Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.  Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.
42803009	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	There are many sites on this local plan that are on green belt land and which, if planning was agreed would have a significantly negative impact on the environment and our futures. Climate change and the environment are clearly now being looked at globally as an emerging crisis and both Government and the local authority need to take this into account before committing to further development on greenbelt land.	
42774945	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	An overly long document.	Comment noted.



42824065	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>We must find ways of resisting the central government dictats on so called objectively assessed housing need. The vast increase in proposed housing stock are clearly detrimental and will only serve to further overheat and destroy the quality of life in an already seriously overpopulated part of the country. We cannot and should not make provision for everyone that might want to come and live here; on the contrary we should use any levers on policy we can to discourage inward movement and encourage outward movement to less developed parts of the country.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42641505	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	<p>who approves a plan? if it is TMBC why do we not limit development to the locally assessed housing need based on waiting lists? I remember a presentation that stated this was about 1500 homes, much less than the 15000 or so being stated.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42684641	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>I still think as a pack TMBC/TWBC/SEVENOAKS should be approaching governments departments to reduce the total number of homes in this whole area. All 3 have severe restrictions and all 3 should not build on ANOB/GREENBELT/FLOOD ZONE 3 as stated in NPPF</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42716705	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>Mr Sunak has already prioritised brown field sites for development. This may require a rebalancing of targets for local boroughs. CPRE have identified sufficient brown field sites to accommodate nearly 1 million new homes. Surely, TMBC should wish to protect greenfield sites in the borough when there are preferable alternatives for development elsewhere in the country.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42544865	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Why is there a 30% increase in housing planned for this borough? This is way above the national average and predicted population growth. We need more green spaces not less for everyday activities to aid mental health in the elderly. Sports fields are not the answer for dog walkers nor wildlife. Recently constructed flower beds add far more than housing estates. Traffic volumes are already too high and queues are an everyday occurrence. This adds to pollution of the area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>

33(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by Section 110 of the Localism Act. It requires local authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues throughout the process of Plan preparation. As demonstrated through the outcome of the 2020 Sevenoaks District Council Local Plan examination and subsequent Judicial Review, if a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its Duty to Cooperate, this cannot be rectified through modifications and an Inspector must recommend nonadoption of the Plan. Whilst Gladman recognise that the Duty to Cooperate is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) it is intended to produce effective policies on cross-boundary strategic matters. In this regard, Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council (hereafter referred to as 'TMBC' or 'the Council') must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with neighbouring authorities, alongside their existing joint working arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross-boundary strategic issues, and the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not simply an issue of consultation but a question of effective cooperation. The NPPF sets out that local planning authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more Statement(s) of Common Ground (SoCG) throughout the plan making process<sup>1</sup>. The SoCG(s) should provide a written record of the progress made by the strategic planning authorities during the process of planning for strategic cross-boundary matters and will need to demonstrate the measures local authorities have taken to ensure cross boundary matters have been considered and what actions

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. The council frequently and effectively engages with key stakeholders under the duty to cooperate.

43629217

0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4

the difficulties that the Planning Inspectorate's (PINS) decision that TMBC did not pass the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) has caused in terms of housing delivery (including of affordable housing), substantially worsening housing affordability and planning decisions being made by appeal, rather than locally. Fernham Homes entirely supports TMBC's decision to withdraw the Local Plan submitted in January 2019 (hereafter referred to as the January 2019 LP) following the report from PINS, and to recommence work on a fresh plan.

The TMBC Local Development Scheme (LDS) (March 2022) envisages adoption in June 2025. It is important that TMBC continues to progress work on its Local Plan at pace. However, this must be balanced against the requirements of:

- a) paragraph 16 c) of the NPPF that that the Local Plan be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between the LPA and communities, organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers etc;
- b) paragraph 31 of the NPPF which requires local plans to be underpinned by relevant, up-to-date and proportionate evidence. Importantly, Paragraph: 038 Reference ID: 61-038-20190315 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) requires that "the evidence needs to inform what is in the plan and shape its development rather than being collected retrospectively";
- c) paragraphs 24 – 27 of the NPPF in relation to maintaining effective cooperation and satisfy the DtC.

All three of the above elements represent significant risks to the timetable in the LDS, as set out below.

- a) Movement from a high level Reg 18 LP to a pre-submission Reg 19 LP Moving directly from a "high level" Reg 18 LP, which is seeking views on "principles" as set out in the Forward, to a detailed pre-submission version

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. There will now be a second round of Regulation 18 consultation.

44459553 0 1.5.1

The Plan should enhance rather than undermine environmental protection to help prevent planet Earth from degrading any further.

Comment noted.

42794625 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

I would like to see Tonbridge and Malling to be welcoming to all parts of society and the local plan should focus on delivering affordable housing for all, not pricing out the children of established families

Comment noted.

38468641 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

1.1.3 should really indicate what the council has managed to build in the last decade to help identify what is a "deliverable" target of homes.

Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

42641505 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

42799649 42800033	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>I find it very worrying and sad that you plan to build in the beautiful countryside surrounding Plaxtol and Shipbourne. The proposals down Back Lane in Shipbourne are a big shock. There is a bench down there, where lots of people sit and have lunch and look at the view. This area will be completely ruined. The same goes for The Street in Plaxtol. This area will really suffer with extra traffic. The infrastructure isn't set-up for such a large increase in houses and the area will be ruined forever. People live here (myself included) because it is green, quiet and beautiful. Once this area has been built on it will never return to how it is now. Please take the time to drive around these areas and appreciate them for their beauty, please don't concrete them over. Has KCC utilised all empty buildings for example. Before building new houses this should surely be the first and best option.</p>	Comment noted.
		<p>I agree</p> <p>.....</p> <p>policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.</p> <p>The NPPF requires that plans set out a vision and a framework for future development and seek to address the strategic priorities for the area. Local Plans should be prepared in line with procedural and legal requirements and will be assessed on whether they are considered 'sound' The NPPF reaffirms the Government's commitment to ensuring up-to-date plans are in place which provide a positive vision for the areas which they are responsible for, to address housing, economic, social and environmental priorities and to help shape the development of local communities for future generations. In particular, paragraph 16 of the NPPF states that Plans should: "a) Be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development; b) Be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable; c) Be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between planmakers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees; d) Contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals; e) Be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation; and f) Serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)." To support the Government's continued objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that the TMBC Local Plan provides a sufficient amount and variety of land that can be brought</p>	Comments noted.
43629217	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4		
42803265	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Indeed a Local Plan is important....it is so important that any housing developments have the appropriate infrastructure to support them which includes ensuring green space/green belt areas are not overrun.</p>	Comment noted.

42806945	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>This section makes reference to housing need. I understand this is based on 2014 figures when there must be later figures available. I also understand that the algorithm contains reference to house prices in the relevant area. That is plainly misleading as an indication of need in an area close to London whose own housing need should not distort that of TMBC and other boroughs surrounding the metropolis. The desire of people to move out of London to cheaper and, arguably pleasanter, environments should not be accommodated in this Local Plan. The Green Belt has always been an essential protection against London sprawl.</p> <p>These proposals would be devastating to the local community. The comments submitted by the Mereworth Parish Council are in agreement with my views. The local infrastructure is already inadequate. Last summer the water supply failed due to demand from consumers nearer to the supply source. Local roads are narrow and could not stand extra traffic. There are no shops.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework, standard approach to need and associated planning practice guidance. However this matter will be considered and reflected within the new housing evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
42808577	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The basis for assessing housing "need" is confused. The procedure is to project population growth, allow for a projected decline in number of persons per household, and then uprate that according to a formula based on the house-price to income ratio (so-called affordability). The population-growth figure is too high and the measure of affordability should be based on the cost of a mortgage and not the price of a house. In other words, there is no need for building at the projected rate, because house prices are in-line with mortgage costs and will fall as interest rates rise.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework, standard method for housing needs and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42587681	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The problem is you are using an out of date algorithm for your calculations for extra housing needs etc. And because the government, for whatever reason, are hell bent on satisfying the needs of developers over the future of our children the future for them is extremely worrying.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework, standard methodology for calculating housing needs and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42770945	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>I agree with the plan being sustainable but you need to ensure that focus should be on brown site development - not on green site fields</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42821633	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>In my former corporate life I have been involved in lot of strategic plans. Nearly all suffer from 'if only wishing would make it so' syndrome. Plans unfold against events, many of which are driven by other actors. Wargaming is the planning tool that allows such possibilities to be considered in a compelling manner cf <a href="https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/battle-test-your-innovation-strategy">https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/battle-test-your-innovation-strategy</a>. It would be comforting to think some thought had been given to this.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42821729	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The inbuilt assumption that there should be 'growth' and 'development' in the area should be challenged. The biggest problem facing the area is overpopulation which has already resulted in the current stressed nature of roads and services. We should be seeking to limit and diminish any economic attractions to the area such that environmental improvements can be facilitated.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42824065	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		

42800065	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Myself and my wife wish to object to sites 59515 and 59516, both within the Cage Green and Angel Ward, being allocated in the Local Plan for housing development. These open spaces are invaluable within the existing built up area and are vital to the health and well-being of local residents. They are used daily by walkers, dog exercising, children, playgroups, Church groups, fetes and informal sports events. Please see the formal representation made on our behalf by SJM Planning dated 3rd November 2022 submitted by</p>	Comment noted.
42213665	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The methodology and aspirations of the TMBC Local Plan seem to be well founded with the best interests of the local population at it's core. I hope that the Plan will succeed in delivering these aspirations without external pressure to modify it from central government or commercial interests.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
42060609	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Local Consultation is absolutely key</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
42756225	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The opportunity for all residents and businesses to comment on the plan has not been achieved by the TMBC as each address in the Borough was not advised of the consultation, reliance being placed on Internet access. This methodology has excluded those who, because they were not advised of the Consultation or do not use computers or 'smart' phones, have not been able to comment. I therefore consider that this Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation is not representative and has therefore failed. For it to be successful the consultation needed to be advised to every household by via mail drop, making them aware, and giving the opportunity for everyone to participate. This includes those who are not technology savvy but never-the-less have valuable views which should be considered.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
42460353	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>It needs to be made accessible to all and make it easy for a wide variety of residents to respond with their views.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>

42803009	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Would it not have been a good idea to have consulted with the residents of Tonbridge and Malling prior to this document being produced? This would have given you a very good understanding of the vision we, the residents have for our Borough which I seriously think is vastly different to the vision the local authority appear to have. How does this local plan 'value our environment' when there are numerous suggestions for development in green belt land?</p> <p>Where was the communication from T&amp;M? Site 59758 Beech Road Mereworth appears to include my property within its boundary. I heard about this from a neighbour the day after a meeting was held at Wateringbury village hall. This came as a great shock and I am very disappointed with the poor communication as I would have appreciated the opportunity of attending that meeting!</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms. The council has been also seeking to directly approach landowners of sites subject to identification.</p>
42016897	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>The local plan should always include the views of local people from all diverse groups I trust there has been some effort to speak to and gain the views of hard to reach groups for example older people and people with learning disabilities and easy Rread has been provided and an opportunity to respond without using the internet</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
42720033	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>Liasion with neighbouring Boroughs essential this time round. !.13 Government expectations too great -15941 homes too many in conjunction with needs of TWBC,SBC AND MBC, especially as we should be following NPPF Guidelines.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
42684641	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>!.4 Agreed</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42756225	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>The Local Plan submitted in January 2019 was withdrawn in part I believe because of inadequate consultation. This 2022 current plan suffers the same lack of a wide consultation, relying on electronic and internet acumen and inadequate promotion of the Consultation taking place. Many local residents are not even aware of this local plan. In my Village, many are elderly and not on Social Media or indeed online, so have no idea this "consultation" is even happening. Every council tax paying resident should be written to with full details of the plan, and given the opportunity to respond offline. If not, any " consultation" will be incomplete and highly unrepresentative.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
42345281	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>Why not arrange meetings to inform residents about the Plan?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>
38779009	0 1.7.1	<p>Why not arrange meetings to inform residents about the Plan?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.</p>

38779009	0 1.7.1	Why not organise meetings at a community level to discuss the Plan?	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
42353345	0 1.7.1	I only heard about this consultation after it was sent to a neighbour by Tom Tugendhat MP. I wonder how representative the consultation will be if nobody is told about it except by chance? How many responses are needed to make the council feel confident it has heard the voices of local people?	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
42752193	0 1.7.1	Not many people I have spoken to know much (if anything) about this. I am not sure all residents have had an opportunity to comment and many weren't aware of the online nature of this consultation. Is there any way to raise awareness among all residents and neighbourhoods?	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
42772769	0 1.7.1	I think consultation is very important, but you need to ensure you reach people so they know there is a consultation. Many people aren't on Facebook, for example, where I've seen this shared. As a council you have people's contact details - could you not ensure that news of future consultations are shared via email (or post, to those that don't have a registered email address with you)? This would ensure all TMBC residents hear about plans in good time to provide feedback.	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
38779009	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	Why not organise meetings in communities to discuss the Plan?	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
42756225	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	I reiterate my previous comment that there is insufficient awareness of the Plan Consultation for it to be considered valid.	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.
45625953	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	We totally object to the plans for future developments.	Comment noted.
42803009	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	The council wants to know our views?? How did you consult with your residents about this Local Plan? I heard about it the day after a local meeting had taken place! Too late for me to attend and make my views known. You state there will be opportunities to comment on the plan as it progresses? How will you alert the residents of T&M so that we can all have our voices heard and voice our priorities? There are many older people who do not use email and who are not computer literate. How are you planning on keeping all residents informed of the next stages?	Comment noted. The Council notified relevant national and local organisations, residents who were registered on the Local Plan database, community groups, businesses, Council's and stakeholders including its youth forum. The Consultation was also advertised via its website and social media platforms.



42016897	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>I am very concerned about the substantial developments in Hermitage Lane their has been given no thought to the infrastructure and services needed and the green space land grab has been substantial. Given that energy supplies are not the only issue with the continuation of the Russian Ukrainian conflict there is also the matter of cereal crops much of this land was arable and it appears no real consideration has been given to this aspect as well as the destruction of the environment. These homes are not affordable to local people far from it and I understand are being purchased by foreign businessman as Investment properties and those seeking homes outside London or for private rental.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42021729	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The village of wouldham already have a restaurant run high street now from the new peters bridge and over 1000 houses that are built .</p> <p>Nothing has been done too help this situation , or the lack if parking , yet another money making plan for over 370 houses . It is not needed in this once small village .Get your planning team out to the village at 6 -9 am and again 4-7 pm when the traffic is road raging through our tiny High Street, No concern is in these plans for residents who live through this mess we were given.</p> <p>Massive lorries still plough through in the day , ignoring road signs .</p> <p>So I am against more houses which will only make this already bad situation worse. 23.09.2022</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
25390689	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The importance of the environment, green space and sustainable development is of paramount importance given the UK's commitment to reducing carbon emissions.</p>	<p>Comment relating to environmental and green space protection noted.</p>
42147201	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>As a long term resident of TMBC I hope this plan includes things such as Better Local Doctor Surgeries. No loss of open spaces in our local communities where children play and us old people sit and enjoy each others company</p>	<p>Comment relating to open space protection noted.</p>
42166945	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Surely it is time to stop concreting over the Kent area with ever more houses whilst the infrastructure simply cannot cope with the existing housing. For example, the provision of roads, schooling, water and medical treatment is already inadequate.</p> <p>Taking just medical, whilst I know that there is a shortage of doctors in the U.K. the national average is around 2.9 doctors per 1,000 population - against only 0.39 in Kent! It is just so difficult for anyone, especially the elderly, to obtain medical help. You are letting down the existing residents whilst still cramming in ever more houses without thought to the impact on local communities. The South East is apparently already one of the more densely populated areas in Europe - please do not add to it.</p> <p>This is not how a civilised country works. Any further housing must be in other less populated areas of the U.K.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Infrastructure Delivery Plan evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>

		I have looked at the details of the plan and the key themes that you have set out and cannot find that they match up. There are several options to remove car parking, which is already in short supply. If this is to encourage more active ways of accessing the area, then what are the proposals to encourage this. Secure parking for bikes for example. Have you considered the age and physical ability of local residents to be able to access the area if not by car. The local businesses would suffer if there was to be less footfall, which could result in longer/short term closing of businesses as they could no longer afford to trade. West Malling could become a ghost centre and this would lose valuable employment as well as income for the council. Several of the areas for building proposed include areas of countryside or are close to historical sites. This would be against the theme that you had set up. Whilst I appreciate there is an acute shortage of affordable housing in the area, the majority of these fall outside your brief. Tricia	Comments relating to sites on green space and parking noted.
42276321	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42320705	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Prime of all these conditions should be that infrastructure of electricity, gas, water, sewage, surface water and contact should be in place prior to anything being done.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Infrastructure Delivery Plan evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
		The infra structure does not support large amounts of development particularly in Platt and Borough Green. There are far to many problems with roads, sewers, lack of doctors. The air quality has always been particularly poor. This is a designated area of outstanding beauty. Without a junction n the M25/26 at Sevenoaks far too much traffic travels along the A25. The road is frequently blocked or damaged. The sewers in the area collapsed last year because they could not cope with current levels of usage. Areas of green belt land will be lost and houses built will destroy this area of outing natural beauty. There are many areas in The area where there are brown field sites that could be used for development and also a vast number of empty retail properties that could easily be converted to domestic use. These areas should be considered first before planning to destroy greenfield sites. Please think carefully before you start building, once you have started we will lose all that is good about living in this area.	Comments relating to green belt and traffic noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling and Green Belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42324865	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42324865	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	This area is already overcrowded and lacks sufficient infracstructure. There should be small developments of affordable housing.	Comment relating to infrastucture provision noted.
42021761	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	I am not sure 1.2.2 is factually correct	Comment noted.
		Who are the "Inspectors"? Term is not defined here or anywhere else on this site I can see.	Comment noted.
42028961	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	Why has it taken nearly 4 years since January 2019 to get a new plan drafted? Surely it is based on the old version. (And don't say "covid"). You need to challenge the pressure. If there is no space once you have exhausted brownfield sites then there is no space. Do not build on green	Comments noted.
42044577	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	fields	

		The local plan is not explicit enough in its options on the hierarchy and how it is implemented:	
		1. use all brownfield first	
		2. maximise housing concentration on brownfield with 2-3 story flats, and minimum 40% social housing.	Comment relating to prioritisation of issues noted.
		3. no loss of green field where plot provides less than 100 housing units	
42197121	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	4. no loss of Green Belt	
38779009	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	1.2.2. is a little economical with the truth in its wording.	Comment noted.
		I believe the Local Plan should take on board the quality of the air in the location of the M20, A20 through Aylesford, Ditton and Larkfield, I believe that any survey on this matter shows that this area is above average in toxic nature of the air and a danger to the health of the residents, therefore any new planning MUST take this into account, also this should impact on any traffic survey done.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling and air quality evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42439425	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42144545	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	review and refresh needed	Comment noted.
		If we don't have a local plan in place we are at the mercy of developers motivated by the need to maximise profits	Comment noted.
38377665	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3		
42442561	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I would like to object to development of 59800 and 59797	Site specific comments noted.
		I was very pleased to see promoting Active Travel as an aim of this plan. We desperately need safe attractive walking and cycling routes to entice people out of their cars. Our roads are congested and it is a source of air pollution as well as climate change. Many people feel (quite rightly) that it is not safe for them or their children to cycle to work or school.	Comment relating to active travel support noted.
38532513	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	no comment	
			Comment noted.
42442561	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3		
42444161	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	This process needs to be simplified further, where can the old plan documents be found and the justification for starting again?	Comment noted.
		The role of the existing [withdrawn] local plan is not clear. The only objection that was noted was that there was a failure in the duty to cooperate. However, it seems that much of the previous plan is being withdrawn with many sites not even included for consideration, presumably because of developer concerns about cost, and not because of their sustainability. If that is not the case, then TMBC need to highlight the approach taken.	Comment noted.
39011745	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3		

42443649	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>I'm not happy with the local authorities being bullied by the government to build too many new houses. Or are the authorities bribed into such actions? Especially in Tonbridge its a nice area with surrounding farms and greenbelt there are no areas of that i would like to see destroyed by indiscriminate building programs. The road network barely copes with existing local traffic and thats compounded by the constant environmental push to walk or ride bikes. Some of us don't have the time or inclination for such frivolity. My business counts on van use and that 20mph thing the government and local authorities stuck us with is miserable. Especially as its just to appease unproven science and environmental radicals. The birthrates in the area don't justify the new builds required, could it be all the guys on boats who just float over at will with no paperwork on them? Or is the idea to gentrification if London by giving Tonbridge the unwanted from those areas? As it is the bus companies cut school buses and won't run a route up Cannon Lane how do the council think they can fix that? I'm totally against the plan to build on farms, greenbelt or flood plains. I don't care if i never walk there green land is the stuff thats cleaning the air. Its like removing the planets air filtration system, The hospital has really long waiting times in A&amp;E and GPs are over subscribed already. Unless the NHS can pluck staff out of the air i can't see how medical infrastructure will cope with a huge population increase. Anyway to stress my point. No don't build in such unreasonable numbers and tell the government to get lost.</p>	<p>Comment relating to the value of green spaces noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.</p>
42561377	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>Surely a plan needs to be continuously maintained rather than replacing it after 10 years. Has the relevant content from the old plan been retained and to what extent does it meet the currently assessed needs?</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42584097	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>The Council needs to take notice of what is in the plan and stick to it and not just do what they want with developers</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42488033	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Section 12 of the NPPF - if an area of relatively recent build housing, for example, Tower View by Kendall Avenue/Monarch Terrace, on KH has already been designed 'well' with green space provided surely to infill that green space now with housing would be contra to this guidance? Any local plan must be adaptable. Events such as COVID 19 and its impact on working patterns show how quickly things can change. In turn, such events</p>	<p>Comment relating to green space protection noted.</p>
42613729	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>often accelerate other trends e.g. home delivery</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
25049761	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>With so much Development proposed by TWBC within its Local Plan on the boundaries of TMBC it is crucial the road infrastructure and proposed development sites infrastructure are constructed first before any major housing developments are constructed and marketed.</p>	<p>Comments relating to road infrastructure provision noted.</p>

42550049	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Before going into the details of individual local plans, having gone through drought like conditions with water cuts and hose pipe bans in the South East should this not be an impetus to move house building north, both increasing climate resilience and helping a levelling up agenda? This is not a "not in my backyard" comment, in fact we just moved from the countryside I. Ightham into town. But the continued focus on house building and development in the south east just looks increasingly short sighted.	- Comment relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42470433	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	The current plan is not positive, it is a negative solution. I am concerned that the lack of a Local Plan being in place over recent years has resulted in a developers free for all and unreversible and horrendous projects being 'waved through'. The Medway Gap, and in particular Ditton have, and continue to take, a 'right kicking ' with the erection of totally inappropriate, large, unsustainable, poor quality and shoddy 'non green' housing.	Comment noted. Comment noted.
42617505	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	Just testing to see if this works	Comment noted.
42166849	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	One aspect of the local plan ought to be the improvement of the infrastructure to overcome existing problems with congestion, water shortage and inadequate sewers before increasing the population by providing more houses. This should be an overriding requirement, not an afterthought.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42436577	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Who assessed your needs? Democratic local control can only work with full visibility.	Comment noted.
42714273	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3		
		1.1.3. 'Our Corporate Strategy recognises that the Local Plan can lead on valuing our environment'. Sites 59808 and 59592 are both Greenbelt land, so building on these sites will not be 'valuing our environment'. 59808 has already been used to deposit 'clean soil on' by Berkeley homes from their Oakhill development to help save the environment from Diesel fumes - are they going to dig it up again? This would surely not help the environment doing it twice. There is evidence that Berkeley Homes were dumping and burying waste on this land, damaging the environment, against their 'clean soil' policy in the planning, so developing this site would affect the environment further	Comments relating to sites and Green Belt issues noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Green Belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42613473	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
		Site 59797	
		I am writing to object to this Grade 1 Metropolitan Green Belt land being considered as part of the Local Plan. This is Agricultural land which is currently farmed by tenant farmers and forms part of their income and way of life. Without this income tenant farmers will not be able to sustain their small businesses. This is also a fast road with a dangerous bend on it which is an accident black spot. Traffic in Wateringbury is already congested with long queues forming West of Wateringbury causing pollution in the village.If this is allowed to be added to the Local Plan the settlements of Wateringbury and Mereworth will become more likely to join up in the future and the character of both villages will be lost. I therefore trust that this land will not be considered or added to the Local Plan for development.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Green Belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42614721	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		

38330977	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	Hildenborough Parish Council would agree with a plan which results in more democratic local control with the Borough Council consulting and listening to the needs/ideas of the Parish Council.	Comments noted.
		It is vital that the Local Plan encompasses the major changes afoot in the world of retail.	
		Like it or not consumers are moving away from the High Street and onto the web. We cannot stop this nor affect this 'drift' by titillating the 'shopping experience'.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new town centres evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
		Given time we will be 'awash' with empty retail properties in town centre locations. With skill these can be transformed into very attractive residences be it houses or flats or penthouses etc etc etc.	
		Use this resource to honour the governments' housing requirement.	
42617505	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Leave all other areas untouched.	
42641505	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	1.2.3 why does the borough have to grow? populations are not growing. job needs are not in the southeast. immigration is falling.	Comment noted.
42762433	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	This is interference from inspectors who clearly have no idea of the issues we have due to an already overcrowded area.	Comment noted.
		<p>I object to the local plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* It will harm the countryside and quiet lanes</li> <li>* The plan will also have a negative traffic impact to and from Kings Hill Centre</li> <li>* the plan will negatively impact local residents of main access</li> <li>* Kings Hill will be overdeveloped with inadequate resource.</li> <li>* as it is outside of the confines of existing developments</li> <li>* Ancient woodland and TPO protected trees will be destroyed.</li> <li>* The plan will harm protected species</li> <li>* the plan will negatively impact on wildlife corridor.</li> <li>* Loss of green open space</li> <li>* we will lose agricultural land</li> <li>* loss of green belt</li> </ul>	Comments relating to traffic, Green Belt and environmental protection noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Green Belt, Green Infrastructure and transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42617217	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		

42641377	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>All new buildings should have solar panels as standard, rain water harvesting systems as standard. And all new housing should be affordable, suitable for all people. All new housing that has been built recently is close to 1 million in cost, we need to build for the people who work in nursing, teaching, uniform services, care workers etc...</p> <p>Also ensuring there is housing for the people who will be maintaining the smooth running of the growing community.</p> <p>Creating green corridors throughout the development to ensure the survival of our rapidly declining wildlife population.</p> <p>I am against this development plan because there will not be enough water to supply all these new homes, the light pollution will be terrible as it seems every one wants to light up the outside of their houses all night long like monuments. We will suffer water and electrical and gas shortages. As where will we get it from?</p> <p>The increase of cars on our crumbling roads, will cause so much damage that there will be non stop road repairs.</p> <p>All new developments should have all services such as sewage, waste water etc.. managed and contained and sustainable to prevent this being dumped in to the rivers and seas.</p>	Comments relating to sustainability measures noted.
42785921	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>I and other members of the public have only become aware of this consultation in the last few days, were notices placed through people's doors? I have sight problems and it is particularly important that documents of this nature are delivered door-to-door in large print. Reading through your timescales it would appear that you've had many years to consider these proposals yet expect members of the public to research and establish data in a very short period. This seems unreasonable/unfair to give appropriate responses.</p> <p>Too much new housing will destroy our community. Housing in this area is already too expensive for our children to live here.</p>	Comments noted.
42712129	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The flood risk from surface run off is already high and more houses will make it worse. We have lost shops and pubs to developers and the community is poorer as a result.</p>	Comment relating to flood risk and community infrastructure noted.
42707233	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>I live in beech road mereworth we really don't need our orchards and fields built on each year we are short of water and have loads more houses will not improve the situation our lane is narrow and extra traffic will not make life any easier why haven't all households had a letter asking our opinion on this matter. Yours not a happy family Mrs and Mr Broad</p> <p>Why did we withdraw the original plan leaving us open to speculative development?</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42800033	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>Are we likely to withdraw this one on the inspectors final report?</p>	Comment noted.

42387681	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Dear Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council. I am not adverse to having some new houses in our village of Wateringbury but we need to preserve the beauty of our village where people enjoy living here. People enjoy improved health through cycling and walking in our village. Our lanes are narrow, by modern standards, and we have a high volume of traffic at significant times of the day sitting on the A26 already having both an environmental impact and safety impact.	Comment relating to traffic and environmental issues noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42806945	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	We have a wonderful array of animals and birds that inhabit our village, we need to preserve them for future generations to come. Our infrastructure is small, a few shops, one doctors surgery, a primary school, this would not sustain further housing growth. See my comments under 1.1	Comment noted.
42822209	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	I believe that all planning should include a detailed review by all local authority departments. Many applications appear to receive a general non-comment from authorities such as the local Highways and Conservation departments. It is not appropriate for these departments and I'm sure others, to just say that an application seems fine to them without backing up why they feel this and justifying their decision. The roads in and around various towns are constantly gridlocked but Highways never takes this into account. Equally, many areas "protected" by being in a conservation area see buildings removed and/or replaced with modern high-rise buildings which are totally out of keeping.	Comment noted.
42715873	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I strongly object to plans to build houses where the current recreation park is. This park is a community hub for families and dog walkers alike. Building on this land will have a negative impact on the community. Outside of the recreation park there is little green space where the older generations will feel comfortable to let their dogs off a lead. It seems TMBC underestimate how valuable this land is to the local community	Comment relating to green space protection noted.
42016897	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	If only the housing development was linked to the existing populations needs as opposed to profit and greed . Developments currently are destroying local communities as they are completely out of reach for young people on minimum wage.	Comment noted.
42044577	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	Challenge - there is no space. Do not build on green spaces or recreational space for children	Comment noted.
38779009	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	No comment	Comment noted.
38377665	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	This is all good but what happens if the government changes its mind? For example, if it is decided that our part of Kent, or as some want, all of Kent is designated an Investment Area?	Comment noted.
42363585	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	What are the penalties for not producing or updating the existing plan?	Comment noted.



		<p>I understand tmhc are looking at sites for new houses in leybourne .  I strongly disagree with the loss of any of our green areas for house building .  these areas are heavily used for recreational activities daily and add to the appeal of leybourne and the enjoyment of living here .  there are a significant amount of very large well established trees that are situated in most areas .  it would be a great environmental disaster to lose these trees plus any childrens playing areas</p>	Comment relating to green space protection noted.
42716257	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42444161	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	No comment	Comment noted.
		<p>I am very concerned that the infrastructure will not be able to cope with more housing developments. We have suffered for the last two years with collapsed sewage pipes on the A25 in Borough Green and Wrotham and collapsed water pipes on Seven Mile Lane; how on earth can we build more with the present infrastructure?</p>	Comment relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42716673	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
		<p>I would wish the Local Plan for TMBC to take account of the rural landscape which is a precious resource within the borough, enjoyed not only by the local inhabitants but also many visitors to the area who take pleasure in the beautiful historic landscape (conservation areas/ AONB). As a borough we need to take account of the ecology in the area where the complex biodiversity is very fragile and under pressure.</p>	
		<p>The infrastructure of services are unable to support the present population, we often have power cuts, the water supply is turned off and the sewage system is inadequate, let alone the provision of heating to buildings. It is not enough for developers to continue to build as the present infrastructure of services to include population needs eg education &amp; health etc are unable to cope. There is a need for the provision of the fundamentals to be undertaken.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new landscape , infrastructure and climate change evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
		<p>The areas to be developed need careful consideration as surely we would not wish to lose valuable farming land required to grow food to urban development. I have noticed a considerable increase with traffic congestion in the borough with the accompanying problems of air pollution which will have an impact upon climate change.</p>	
		<p>Consideration of the location of the development plans of surrounding boroughs also needs to be taken into account as these may put extra pressure upon resources in TMBC.</p>	
42719169	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42616033	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	* the number of dwellings aspirational and not sustainable deliverable	Comment noted.

		<p>location and residency of this rural development. Our previous home was in Bromley and we sought a more peaceful and relaxed environment to live. As such Kings Hill does not qualify as a suburban location and should not now be rammed full of buildings to make it such!</p> <p>One of the key aspects was the 'openness' of the residential areas interspersed with green areas, landscaping (for which Kings Hill is a multi-award winner AND is funded by the Residents Management Fees) and a relatively quiet location (there is no throughfare of the residential areas either).</p> <p>The sporadic nature of the local bus services (routing as well as operating hours) and distance to nearest train station (with minimalist timetable) and far from fast services (we commuted to London from here for almost 10 years and sorely missed these aspects compared to Bromley) clearly contest any assertion of 'Kings Hill the suburb'!</p> <p>The residential aspects are particularly obvious when arriving on Kings Hill as you make your way through the offices and commercial buildings then arriving to the more open, green and altogether more attractive housing area.</p> <p>Kings Hill already has its own problems. Off street parking, general parking and some of the narrow roads, mews and road features already create issues for general driving let alone for refuse collections, delivery vehicles and, of course, emergency vehicles. Currently in play are some very draconian measures to supposedly assist with these issues by adding a ridiculous amount of parking restrictions, using double yellow lines to many</p>	<p>Comment relating to Kings Hill and infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42719585	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
		<p>It would be helpful if the local plan could be clearer for members of the public giving a clearer idea of the numbers and location of houses proposed for each option in the form of an interactive map. In order to be fully informed about the impact of development it would be helpful if all local boroughs published their consultations at the same time so that proposed housing developments near borough boundaries could be understood and the impact on these areas as a whole.</p> <p>Some of the proposals of the plan aim to build huge numbers of new homes in countryside and so forever changing the nature of the Borough in a negative way. Once the agricultural land is lost then the Garden of England will no longer exist.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment relating to green belt and agricultural land protection noted.</p>
42616993	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4		
42720897	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>We would not need so many houses if people did not keep moving in to Kent, taking 'our' homes and jobs.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
38435937	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>Is there any way of finding out if the Borough or County populations are really increasing, or if the 'need' is caused by in-comers? With regards the impact isn't being viewed for BGGC</p>	
42721377	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>road links entering and exiting Ighiteam to Tonbridge without increase of road widths isn't viable</p>	<p>Comments relating to road infrastructure provision noted.</p>

42722305	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	In the introduction there is no mention of whether the plan is reliant on adjacent local authorities in the provision and allocation of housing need and community infrastructure, can this be clarified.	Comment noted. This matter will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.
42724289	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Hello,</p> <p>re plans for site 59884 (Kingshill) Inam objecting on 3 grounds- objective 1,2 and 12. This green area is integral to the residents of Kingshill and allows a free space to exercise, picnic, walk and play with dogs.</p> <p>On a personal level, my children learned to ride their first bikes there, played frisbee and had a safe place to meet their young friends in the fresh air. This space was also invaluable during lockdown for meeting others outdoors. Currently it's a beautiful site with meadows flowers for the bees and butterflies and the shade provided from the various trees is very welcome in summer. Do we want to lose all this for more commercial gain? It would be a crying shame.</p> <p>There are no open spaces for children to kick a ball or frisbee on Kingshill and the gardens are too small. Not everyone can afford to be a member of a gym and we have increasing obesity and mental health issues in the young- it would be very wrong ethically to build over this space for all the above reasons.</p>	Comments relating to the provision of green space and playspace noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
25049761	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>With the extent of housing planned within TMBC/ TWBC MBC / SBC It is essential that robust polices are introduced to ensure that neighbouring LPA's fully cooperate as well as KCC. Major infrastructure should be provided prior to any large development construction of houses.</p> <p>Developers should be held more accountable especially with larger developments where social housing/ affordable housing allocations are reduced at construction stage. Kings Hill is a prime example.</p> <p>Some areas of the plan do not seem to take sustainable development into consideration as building on good quality farm land will have a negative impact on how the borough and country will be able to have sustainable agriculture and will increase climate change due to food having to travel greater distances.</p>	Comments relating to infrastructure provision noted.
42720897	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>Add a comment  <a href="https://consultations.tmbc.gov.uk/TMBCLocalPlanReg18/makeRepresentation?docid=12964852&amp;partid=12965140&amp;sdid=&amp;nextURL=%2FTMBCLocalPlanReg18%2FviewCompoundDoc%3Fdocid%3D12964852%26partid%3D12965076%26sessionid%3D%26voteid%3D%26clientuid%3D38330977">https://consultations.tmbc.gov.uk/TMBCLocalPlanReg18/makeRepresentation?docid=12964852&amp;partid=12965140&amp;sdid=&amp;nextURL=%2FTMBCLocalPlanReg18%2FviewCompoundDoc%3Fdocid%3D12964852%26partid%3D12965076%26sessionid%3D%26voteid%3D%26clientuid%3D38330977</a>)</p>	Comment noted.
38330977	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	Assessing needs for housing is supported but often needs are not met because developers prefer to build a different type of housing to that actually needed by the populations. It is essential to have a mix of all types of housing in an area to provide for a balanced society of the very young to the very old.	

42641505	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>1.3.3 "aspirational" what is the plan aspirational to? profits of house builders or maintaining the borough for residents and voters?</p> <p>1.3.4 when meeting the needs that cannot be met in other boroughs, who decides if the other borough cannot meet these? is it them? how do we know they are not pushing off this issue onto other boroughs so they can maintain their preferred environment?</p>	Comment noted.
42762433	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	What has this got to do with the Government. These are local issues to be resolved by local people not faceless civil servants in Whitehall.	Comment noted.
42768321	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	The planning system should be local resident-led.	Comment noted.
38330977	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	It should take into account local Infrastructural Plans, local circumstances and the needs of those already living in the area. It is important that housing and commercial development is not considered in isolation but local circumstances are taken into account and addressed in conjunction with development. Hildenborough Parish Council has submitted separately its idea of what the local plan should mean to Hildenborough, taking into account the needs of the whole of the Borough by completing this consultation.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Infrastructure Delivery Plan evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42762433	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	My comments under section 1.1 apply.	Comment noted.
42787713	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4		Comment noted.
42794625	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>Government expectations should have made reference to the global warming limits agreed in 2021 by the COP to the UN Climate Change Treaty, held in UK. Please ensure that TMBC honours this international commitment, to which the UK Government is a Party.</p> <p>This whole document is far too complicated for people to make any comment on at all.</p>	Comment noted.
42751073	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Very concerned about the flood risk around Hadlow being in a hollow and the river Bourne often not able to cope.	Comment relating to flood risk a noted.
42800033	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>No idea where to put this in this document</p> <p>can we object to the number of houses the government has targeted with our own figures?</p>	Comment noted.
42758785	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I would like this plan to keep East and West Malling as country villages rather than just a massive extension of London. There must be adequate housing for local young (and old) people not just overpriced housing for those escaping the even more overpriced housing in London.	Comment relating to character protection noted.
42770945	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>The plan must not under any circumstances use Greenbelt or Farmland for development. Given the lessons learnt from the Ukraine war we as a nation need to be more self sufficient so covering these areas with concrete is sheer folly- not to mention the effects of Global Warming which poses a massive threat that NO ONE is taking seriously !</p> <p>Brownfield sites must be found</p>	Comments relating to the role of agricultural land noted.

42805089	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	We are already overcrowded in this Borough with too many people requiring services and infrastructure that is totally inadequate for our current population. We need to "level up " by building in the North of England, the SE is saturated tell this to the government!	Comment noted.
42773121	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Our town is being swallowed up with new buildings, it is changing for the worst, the town does not have decent shops , the new homes are being just thrown up, the area in quincewood gardens must not be lost, it is used daily by children playing football, families , dog walkers , people just relaxing, it is a space used on several occasions by the air ambulance, it would cause distress and mental health deterioration to the near families if more housing are allowed to ruin this area of green , I believe it is vital for peoples health and well being to sustain this area of tranquility, more homes, less parking spaces, more chance of road congestion, this is a public park area, not another estate, the crime rate could escalate , people first , there are other areas outside the town that should be considered, plus local schools already over crowded, and GPS , THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE , PLEASE RECONSIDER	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Infrastructre Delivery Plan evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42780609	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	It is clear that the plan containing 16000 new dwellings with retail support - stores etc will have a material effect on traffic, both private motoring and deliveries.  I believe this plan should require an upgrade to the M26/25 to alleviate traffic on A25 between Sevenoaks/Seal and Borough Green/Wrotham Heath. I recognise this is outside TMBC area, but we're affected by it. The M25 junction at Sevenoaks should be upgraded such that traffic can exit travelling West on M26, and join M26 at Junc. 5 to travel East. This would reduce traffic considerably between Sevenoaks and Wrotham Heath and upgrade connectivity for the area.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport and town centre evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42814689	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	I am concerned that the data underpinning the housing targets does not reflect changes in people's living and working habits as a result of the Covid 19 pandemic. I would like to see that the next stages of the process are informed by research into this area	Comment noted.
42822209	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	When considering planning applications, the proposed time frame for the development should be clearly identified at the outset and penalties (including the withdrawal of planning permission) should be agreed with all parties at the outset.	Comment noted.
42787713	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	The Local Plan is indeed an important step towards ensuring Tonbridge & Malling has a sustainable and well thought through approach to meeting the national housing plan. The consultation meeting in Wateringbury was very much welcome. In meeting the plan, TMBC MUST ensure particular attention is paid to local infrastructure to support ongoing housing development. Wateringbury Village has many non-housing related constraints, including ageing utility infrastructure, traffic density in peak periods and Green Belt land which contributes to an area of outstanding beauty. Any development plan needs to ensure infrastructure investment and action is in place prior to 'breaking ground' for any development.	Comments relating to infrastructure provion at Waterinbury noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

42788801	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	The Green belt together with associated ANOB sites within this region should be afforded the upmost protection.	Comment relating to green belt protection noted.
42798817	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I was a bit shocked that this document lacks an overarching commitment within the introduction to prioritising sustainable energy sources, as well as facilitating and enabling the supply of sustainable energy. Securing localised and sustainable energy sources should be identified as an overall strategic priority and/or commitment. We need longer term thinking and related commitments and planning to address the energy supply and sustainable sourcing of energy.	Comment relating to sustainable energy noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42806721	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Over many years consultations and plans to change the situation with the Traffic Lights, at Wateringbury, have been put forward. Due to the layout there can be no solution. These lights are always busy and therefore building more houses in the area, I note outside Wateringbury and between Wateringbury and Teston, is only going to make things worst. Challenge the govt. I am sure that a nationally imposed destruction of local green space would be very damaging. Councils need to collectively respond that they will not meet these targets	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42044577	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2		Comment noted.
42060609	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	We must get this in order. It adds such a huge burden to the Cllrs and the Residents when they are totally helpless regarding planning and their area. Planning meetings are almost a waste of time.	Comment noted.
42442561	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	no comment	Comment noted.
42444161	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	No comment	Comment noted.
42530881	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	Agree it is important to have a local plan You paid consultants to do a "local plan" before at cost to us as tax payers and then could not agree it. How much money have you wasted employing consultants to do this again????? If the muppet councillors cannot agree on a local plan after paying lots of (our) money to consultants they should all be sacked.	Comment noted.
42556129	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2		Comment noted.
42584097	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	Agree 1.4.1 if local government stick to it.	Comment noted.
42633313	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	An up to date plan is important to stop planning by appeal and to stop the planning process being managed by individuals not local to Tonbridge and Malling who have no local knowledge and sympathy for our beautiful green belt, villages and AONB. Very poor that this has not been in place for so long. This has had a disastrous effect on Ditton with the waiving through of the Ditton Edge Development. A disgraceful and very rushed Zoom decision meeting. Railroaded by 'savvy' council staff and 'horse trading' by local councillors. All of whom should be ashamed of themselves.	Comment noted.
42617505	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	Whilst understanding the need for a Local Plan it would make more sense if the criteria for setting the housing needs was set by Local Authorities and not forced upon our Borough by Central Government. Whatever happened to Localism?	Comment noted.
42478721	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2		Comment noted.
42716001	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	We think it is a good idea to have a local plan.	Comment noted.
42718081	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	We do need a plan but things do change beyond our control sometimes so we need to be flexible.	Comment noted.

42719265	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	I agree that decisions need to be made democratically by the people who live and work here and not by those who have nothing to do with the Local Plan and have no idea as to the pros and cons, i.e. Government.	Comments noted.
38330977	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	We agree with the above statement. My wife and I would support option 1 , after some thought. 1) infrastructures is already existing in those areas and there any extension should be more economical. 2) The very purpose of the Green Belt was to stop governments doing exactly this. 3) Areas of outstanding natural beauty are environmentally important, and again isn't this why they have been designated.	Comment noted. Support for option 1 noted, including comments relating to green belt protection and environmental issues.
42817249	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Finally the pandemic proved one thing, that access to green open spaces and nature has a beneficial effect on mental health wellbeing, and therefore a cost saving to NHS	
42762433	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	What right has the Government to interfere with local plan designed by local people?	Comment noted.
42768321	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	The coercive style of writing this consultation document is designed to make people think I better go along with it because it is the devil that I know rather than government imposition of decisions. Regarding democratic control in 1.4 the participation levels will be minimal because of the awkwardness and inaccessibility of the consultation procedure. Many Ightham residents have commented on the lack of information regarding planning meetings and have consequently missed meetings.	Comment noted.
42828705	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	Having read the Local Plan, I do not agree that our green spaces, which are very well used by local residents and visitors should be built on. We have lived here since 1965 and enjoy walking on our local green spaces. With regard to your plans for Martin Square car park, are you trying to close our local shops, not everyone can walk to the shops and its nice to have local shops nearby, and your proposals would surely close them down. The Leisure Centre car park, this is very well used and is always very with most of the car parking being used by visitors to the Leisure Centre, so are you proposing to close this as well to the detriment of local people and visitors alike. Larkfield Football Club is very well supported and its nice for the boys and parents to have this facility and they have just spent a lot of time, effort and money upgrading the site. So why would you want to ruin the footballers enjoyment having a very good facility to be able to use now that it has been refurbished. In short we find the Councils plans are out of touch and detrimental to the needs of the local residents.	Comment relating to open space and car park protection noted.
42762433	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	This smacks of coercion by central government to interfere with local vision of the borough dictated by faceless mandarins in Whitehall who have no knowledge of the difficulties we face day to day.	Comment noted.
42787713	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	The Local Plan is a very welcome approach as it does prevent poorly considered and speculative planning proposals	Comment noted.

42833153	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	There needs to be better planning for new housing so that there is adequate Infants/junior schools so that this cuts down in unnecessary journeys. Even in Larkfield the closest school we could get a place in is over 2 miles away so we hav to drive.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure delivery plan evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42794625	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	Agree	Comment noted.
42806945	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	There should be an up-to-date Local Plan when Government planning policy has stabilised.	Comment noted.
42821729	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	Has any effort been made to mesh with the local plans of other boroughs, for reasons of economy of scale, greater resilience a need for cooperation etc?	Comment noted.
42722625	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	RE " the risk of intervention Government would increase, where plan-making would be managed by individuals not local to Tonbridge & Malling." This would go against democratic principles, no government should be allowed to do this,, and I will not vote for any member of a party that thinks this is acceptable.	Comment noted.
42016897	0 1.5.1	2040 is a long way off and there has to be built in formal review there is no point in putting in a plan and continuing with it if it is not achieving its projected outcomes	Comment noted.
42028961	0 1.5.1	What context are decisions to be put in from now until 2025 if there is no Local Plan?	Comment noted.
42833121	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	It seems to me that Tonbridge town centre is already overcrowded, does not have the infrastructure for further housing or additional traffic, let alone enough schools, doctors, dentists, or parking. The sewage system is insufficient, the pollution levels in the town centre are way above safety level. it would be best to create a new settlement	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport and infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42832929	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	The Plan must include firm requirements for developers to provide carbon neutral housing; solar panels on all south facing roofs; air or ground source heat pumps; car charging; prepare for driverless cars; ensure building plans include meeting the needs to combat higher temperatures and more extreme weather. All garden boundaries and fences should include wildlife corridor holes between all properties for small animals such as voles and hedgehogs. Water and ponds should be included in plans. All outdoor lighting should be "Dark Skies" compliant: pointing downwards and warm temperature below 3,000 K. As much of this area is AONB, every effort must be made to make any development environmentally friendly and follow John Ruskin's dictum: "When we build, let us think that we build to last forever". Gladman consider that the most important feature is the creation of sustainable places, where housing needs are met in full and affordability is much improved. Other elements should feature within this overarching element, but it is imperative that the Local Plan is progressed with the intention to plan for and provide support for the delivery of new sustainable communities and homes. All the elements can be addressed through delivering sustainable new residential led developments	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new climate change evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.  Comment relating to sustainable development and housing growth noted.
43629217	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		



42617505	0 1.5.1	Does this mean that all this work of producing a 'plan' is for a document that will not be adopted till 2025? If so what is all this rush about and this imminent discussion 'cut off' of early November?	Comment noted.
44275681	44277153 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Given the housing needs of the Borough it's important that the vision set out in the Local Plan seeks to address this need and recognise the importance housing has on the social, economic, and environmental future of the Borough. The local housing needs requirement should, as set out below, be treated as a minimum and provision made to exceed this minimum by at least 20% so as to address the acute housing needs of the Borough. Housing delivery and housing affordability should be key tenants of the Vision. The opportunity for new development to assist in realising growth in the required infrastructure and also enhanced Green Infrastructure (recognising environmental enhancement) are also relevant.</p> <p>Regulation 18 Local Plan. The document is in four sections: • Introduction and Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 1 Responses to the 50 questions in the Regulation 18 Local Plan</li> <li>• Appendix 2. Sustainability Appraisals and additional information on sites relevant to Kings Hill</li> <li>• Appendix 3 Traffic report sponsored by Mereworth PC, published in 2019</li> </ul> <p>The Parish Council recognises that for the New Local Plan TMBC has adopted a new approach to The Local Plan Regulation 18 and we appreciate the involvement of the Parish Council and the public at this stage of the process. We hope that the Green Belt will be extended between Kings Hill and East Malling and West Malling. Kings Hill Parish Council found the questions within the Regulation 18 Local Plan document extremely difficult to answer in a helpful way. The Parish Council has received much feedback from residents that the process is difficult, and the Parish Council is concerned that this will impact on the number of submissions.</p> <p>Over the last few years, local residents have fought hard to protect the countryside around Kings Hill from excessive development. The inclusion of these sites in the Regulation 18 Local Plan has created mental anguish and depression for residents, and there are frequent comments along the line of 'Maybe it's time to leave Kings Hill'. We call for a rebalancing of the housing figures for Kings Hill by reducing the number of proposed homes in the area outside the Green Belt and a reassessment of Brownfield sites.</p> <p>We recognise that many of the issues are the result of national planning regulation and process. We urge the Borough Council to use every opportunity to lobby government and our MPs to recognise that the special difficulties experienced by authorities on the fringes of the Green Belt. In addition, Kings Hill has serious concerns about the enforcement of Local I would like to see borough councils co-ordinating the release and closing dates of their local plans so we can be informed about all the proposed development in our area at the same time.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new housing targets evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p> <p>Comment relating to the form of the consultation noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance however concerns in relation to the form and future of Kings Hill noted. The matter of infrastructure provision and support will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
44304385	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	I would like to see borough councils co-ordinating the release and closing dates of their local plans so we can be informed about all the proposed development in our area at the same time.	Comment noted.
42616993	0 1.5.1	What is a time horizon???	Comment noted.
42768321	0 1.5.1		

42661217	0 1.5.1	The consultation papers are complex and require in-depth study. The time available for this is limited and unreasonable for most residents in the Borough	Comment noted.
42785921	0 1.5.1	I and other members of the public have only become aware of this consultation in the last few days, were notices placed through people's doors? I have sight problems and it is particularly important that documents of this nature are delivered door-to-door in large print. Reading through your timescales it would appear that you've had many years to consider these proposals yet expect members of the public to research and establish data in a very short period. This seems unreasonable/unfair to give appropriate responses.	Comments noted.
42794625	0 1.5.1	Agree	Comment noted.
42800033	0 1.5.1	Does that mean we will be at risk from speculative developers until 2025 ? The base date is two years ago. Since that time there has been considerable development and new homes provided	Comment noted.
42682465	0 1.5.1	FECL Support the plan period to 2040	Comment noted.
25406913	25406817 1.5.1	See responses to earlier statements. Finalization of the Local Plan should await further, more up-to-date Government advice.	Comment noted.
42806945	0 1.5.1	Frank on behalf of the Corporation of Hadlow College and the Corporation of West Kent and Ashford College ('the Colleges') – both in liquidation-, the landowners of Court Lane Nurseries, Court Lane, Hadlow, TN11 0RF ('the site'). This document provides a response to the questions contained within the Regulation 18 Consultation Document and provides a case for development at the site, including exceptional circumstances for the site to be released from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development. The Colleges were placed into Educational Administration in May 2019 and August 2019 respectively and placed into liquidation on 11th August 2022. The leases with North Kent College ('NKC') (the party adopting ongoing education provision at the Hadlow campus site) expired on 30th September 2022, at which point, NKC vacated the site. Any future realisations from the site would first flow to the Department of Education and would directly benefit the taxpayer. The site is 6.5 hectares / 16.1 acres in size and is located to the east of Hadlow (a 'Rural Service Centre'). It currently comprises a range of uses (which are now mostly vacant) including horticultural glasshouses and associated agricultural structures / areas of hardstanding; a children's nursery; a number of building and structures previously used in the provision of education; and a number of structures used for commercial uses. As such, the site is partially brownfield / previously developed land and is largely vacant and in a state of disrepair. Without redevelopment, the site will be left derelict and would become an eyesore for the village. The site's redevelopment is therefore critical, and a site allocation will help this be achieved in a collaborative manner with the Council. Adjoining the site is a live planning application for 57 dwellings. This site previously formed a draft allocation in the now withdrawn Local Plan (allocation LP25(s)) for 66 dwellings. The site is	Comments relating to site specifics and the Green Belt noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Green Belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
44336545	42807969 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		

Brownfield sites must take priority for development. Which thus favours Option 1&2

Infrastructure in rural areas is crumbling, with narrow roads taking volumes of traffic which was never conceived previously.

Any of the smaller developments chosen, must consider the impact of any increased traffic and services required to make any site viable. As we are losing our only daytime bus service; this will cause traffic increase

Services (water/drainage and electricity) are operating at the top end of their limits in the villages; for which major infrastructure developments could be horrendously expensive.

Communications infrastructure is at its limit, the village overhead cabling is representative of a third world country! At least opting for Options 1 or 2 will offer easier solutions to providing good (cheaper) infrastructure opportunities.

The only plots which affect Trottiscliffe directly, noted under 'Borough Green and Wrotham' are 59730 & 59736 which is a repeat of the same site! The comments below are particularly relevant regarding access onto a bend, which is a 50mph limit and drivers all appear to push the limit between Trottiscliffe and Addington; with no infrastructure and amenities available to the site.

Comment relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

42804769 0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

As discussed at the meeting on Tuesday, the questionnaire/consultation document is very difficult to negotiate ones way through; although, we have respoded as a Parish Council body seperately; below are my primary comments.

42684641 0 1.5.1

1.5 The timeline to 2040 is good because by that time areas prone to flooding will be showing there true colours and CO2 emissions from cars should be reducing. In the meantime grow more trees!

Comment noted.

in producing its Local Plan and appreciates the opportunity to comment early in the Local Plan process. It is noted that within this Regulation 18 consultation, although growth strategies are presented, the Borough Council is not giving any indication at this stage as to whether it has a preferred growth strategy. It is noted that Appendix B provides a list of proposed sites, and aside from initial consideration of these sites within the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, there is little consideration as to whether these sites are actually suitable for development. The County Council's response has provided initial commentary on all of the proposed growth strategies put forward but given the lack of detail available for the options presented, this response is not providing detailed feedback or a preferred strategy at this stage. KCC would welcome continued discussions as a preferred growth strategy emerges. The County Council has highlighted that spatial strategy options which propose focusing growth allocations within one area of the Borough are likely to result in considerable infrastructure pressures in the area, unless the development proposed is able to provide critical mass to meet its own infrastructure need.

To deliver sustainable development, close working and a collaborative approach with all key stakeholders will be crucial – taking in to account all necessary infrastructure and services required to deliver robust and resilient communities during the plan period and beyond within the Borough – whilst also considering any cross boundary, strategic implications of growth. The County Council would therefore welcome continued engagement as the growth strategy for the Borough is developed and sites are identified for allocation. The County Council is committed to working with the Borough Council and other key stakeholders to ensure that sustainable growth is supported by necessary infrastructure – that is planned for, funded and

Comment noted. The council will continue to engage with its neighbouring authority and key stakeholders (including the County Council) on a regular basis through the duty to cooperate. Requested input into Statement of Common Ground noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Infrastructure Delivery Plan evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

44422593

0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

I am amazed that the new local plan almost entirely ignores the global situation with regard to climate change and especially the already shortage of food evidenced by rising prices.

For most of our lives we have relied on Gold to be the safest asset in the world, this is now in question as we are mining more and more and reducing it's value, it has lost 12% of its value in the last 7 years –

THE NEW GOLD WILL BE AGRICULTURAL LAND. Climate change will dramatically reduce the world's ability to feed us by inundating huge areas of farming land by flooding and salt invasion leading to crippling shortages and starvation on a grand scale. This is now exacerbated by war hastening the shortage and raising food prices.

Comment relating to climate change and agricultural land noted. This matter will be reflected within the climate change evidence and the next Regulation 18 document.

Even before war became a big issue, we have been repeatedly told that, to prevent or mitigate climate change effects, the time to act is now which seems to be ignored by local governments in the UK – including the TMBC plan - and only paid lip service too by national government .

EVERY SCRAP OF FARM LAND IS VITAL – building on it is suicide.

Our local plan is timed to cover 10 years but unless we include the preservation of every corner of farm land NOW we will never get it back.

Unless we and the rest of the world wakes up to this we will hasten the demise of the human race, starvation will depopulate the world and there will be no need for any new housing.

45536737

0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

Infrastructure must include water supply and sewers, many of which in the Borough are old and often in need of repair.

25390689

0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

Comment noted.

I understand that a failure to cooperate was the reason for the Inspector's rejection of the earlier Plan. I hope this issue will be addressed this time.

38779009

0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

Comment noted.

Climate Change should be addressed specifically not just with reference to sustainability.

25390689

0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

Comment noted.

My comments are thus The area in which this Borough is situated is defined as Metropolitan Green Belt needing exceptional circumstances to allow development. It is an area of extremely special environmental significance - An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).Communities are mostly a collection of small rural villages and building houses on greenbelt would change the area and cause harm to the setting of AONB.

I personally am not against sustainable housing programmes; but due consideration must be given to the effect on the environment. Developers have already built mixed housing in TMBC where the infrastructure is in place and could be developed further without affecting the greenbelt etc., These areas should be considered to be expanded and therefore, protected areas are then left alone.

Comments relating to the environment and the Green Belt noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

42487649

0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

In closing, once an area of national importance is built upon, then it is lost forever. A part of the Garden of England warrants nurturing and protection for national and local interest for today, tomorrow and for generations to come.

AONB - once this has gone it will have been lost forever. I am for the building of affordable housing for local people, but that should not mean large scale development across the countryside.

To respond to the questions posed in the local plan, regulation 18:

Question 1: Which elements should feature in the vision for the borough in 2040?

Answer 1: All are equally important

Question 2: Do you agree that this settlement hierarchy should be retained and inform the spatial strategy for the Local Plan?

Answer 2: No. Borough Green should be classed as "Other Rural Settlements" to avoid further urban development detracting from the essentially rural character of the borough as described in sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.4.

Question 3: Which spatial strategy option do you prefer?

Answer 3: Option 2 - Urban: Development focussed on sites within as well as adjacent to urban settlements.

Question 4: What are your reasons for selecting this particular spatial strategy option for the Local Plan?

Answer 4: Focusing development in existing urban areas makes use of existing infrastructure and avoids the untidy sprawl of disconnected developments where inadequate or no infrastructure exists nor is unlikely to be provided in sufficient quantity.

Question 5: Which quantum option for the spatial strategy do you prefer?

Answer 5: Option A - meeting assessed housing need on the understanding that the housing stock created is local people to own or rent not for speculators.

Comment opposing large scale development within the Green belt noted. Answers to specific questions posed also noted.

45644993

0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5

Question 6: What are your reasons for selecting this spatial strategy option?

		<p>but abuts the boundary. 2. We are very vulnerable to development that generates more traffic through our village, especially given the proportion of speeding vehicles as evidenced by professional traffic surveys. Current Local Plan Status &amp; Implications. 3. The residents of T&amp;M must strongly regret the failure to ensure that the previous Reg19 submission would at least pass the test of discharge of Duty to Cooperate (DtC).</p> <p>4. That failure must lay at the feet of Officers and Members and it is assumed that lessons have been learned so that the next Reg19 does not fail that test. Presumably procedures have been embedded to ensure that discharge of DtC encompasses all relevant third parties, is evidenced for the future Examination and engages senior Members at certain points so that necessary guidance and instructions are given to Officers and Member-accountability is clearly demonstrated. 5. However, given the absence of a valid Local Plan and of a Five Years' Housing Supply, it is residents who now suffer from unwelcome developments taking advantage of the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development. 6. And "residents" include those outside T&amp;M who are directly affected, or potentially affected, by such developments, including residents of Teston. 7. This situation looks as if it will persist into 2025. 8. It is assumed that T&amp;M has dedicated a sizeable budget to defending the least welcome sites at appeal and is also ensuring that KCC provides strong support when, in particular, local road infrastructure would become even more stressed by development being permitted at appeal. If that assumption is incorrect, it is somewhat regrettable that T&amp;M does not endeavour to compensate at appeal for some of the damage potentially caused by failure to establish an adopted Local Plan Review.</p>	<p>Comments relating to the spatial strategy options and concerns about infrastructure provision noted. Responses to the specific questions posed also welcomed. In relation to the approach of housing numbers the council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance, but will also be subject to new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. Comment relating to traffic and road capacity noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
45646977	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>9. As we understand it, for some reason KCC Highways no longer sends Whilst the overall structure of the Plan must be decided at a Borough level, the plan should make it clear that the implementation of local development allocations once decided should be predominantly determined by local residents.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
25315361	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>I am writing to you with my comments on future planning as I do not have a computer. I am very concerned with any future housing developments because the hospitals are not coping now - how can they carry on with thousands more people from new housing. They will never catch up. Because of the wait for hospital and doctor appointments, health problems get worse. The infrastructure is never dealt with, roads are congested, doctors full. Maidstone is swamped with new housing which is horrendous. You are now allowing building on farmland, shouldn't farm land be kept for food production as there are many world shortages. Isn't it about time second home purchasing was banned? There are also water shortages because of climate change and too much housing development.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling and infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
45653281	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		

45653505 42444161	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5 0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>My personal response to your Local Plan consultation I wish to register my objection to this proposal; it is greenbelt land and has been dug up and ruined for years and now we want our it back again. We do need houses, but not at this cost, and your reliefroad will not work because 3000 houses will generate more traffic than we have now. We already have declared Air Quality Management Areas here due to serious levels of toxic NO2 and PM0.1 I 2.5 and 10.0 from quarrying and mineral extraction and restoration ofland works. We already have unknown health issues. TMBC have rightly invested thousands of pounds into the '15 Slips campaign' to re-instate the long overdue missing slip roads in the vicinity ofM25 15 Sevenoaks. These slip roads will facilitate our West Kent Bypass to connect the M26/ A2 I. This is the bypass we need not a mass housing estate road for 3,000 houses and associated traffic. The whole area will be blighted, and chaotic traffic jams created worse than we have now. I look forward to receiving confirmation that my concerns have been duly included into the feedback from the community.</p>	<p>Comment relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be addressed within new transport modelling and infrastructure evidence to support the local plan.</p>
42444161	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	no comment	Comment noted.
45653697	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>We find it impossible to consider the number of new homes proposed in this Area. Our present infrastructure will not cope with it. We in Platt are served by the A25 that is used by many large lorries for the Quarries and Brickworks causing air pollution and noise apart from traffic hold ups on a regular basis. Occasionally we have a "high" lorry stuck under the bridge near to the recent sand quarry. Other roads in Platt are narrow country lanes and many are single lane and really struggle with the existing traffic without even more that would result from any further serious development. Platt Industrial Estate is expanding and adding to the problems along the A25 already. We understand we are a green belt area that needs protection from further development. We would also require additional schools and doctors to meet the demands on local services.</p>	Comments relation to infrastructure provision noted.
42585953	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>I see nothing here regarding the service levels required to sustain and support new building initiatives. At present there are hardly enough doctors taking on new patients. There are hardly no dentists providing National Health coverage. The roads into and out of Tonbridge are snarled-up during mornings and evenings. There is poor water pressure. There isn't enough water available in the reservoirs etc. Sewage is already being discharged into the sea and rivers. This is the situation now. How will adding more houses improve the situation?</p>	Comment noted.



		<p>AONB - once this has gone it will have been lost forever. I am for the building of affordable housing for local people, but that should not mean large scale development across the countryside.</p> <p>To respond to the questions posed in the local plan, regulation 18:</p> <p>Question 1: Which elements should feature in the vision for the borough in 2040?</p> <p>Answer 1: All are equally important</p> <p>Question 2: Do you agree that this settlement hierarchy should be retained and inform the spatial strategy for the Local Plan?</p> <p>Answer 2: No. Borough Green should be classed as "Other Rural Settlements" to avoid further urban development detracting from the essentially rural character of the borough as described in sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.4.</p> <p>Question 3: Which spatial strategy option do you prefer?</p> <p>Answer 3: Option 2 - Urban: Development focussed on sites within as well as adjacent to urban settlements.</p> <p>Question 4: What are your reasons for selecting this particular spatial strategy option for the Local Plan?</p> <p>Answer 4: Focusing development in existing urban areas makes use of existing infrastructure and avoids the untidy sprawl of disconnected developments where inadequate or no infrastructure exists nor is unlikely to be provided in sufficient quantity.</p> <p>Question 5: Which quantum option for the spatial strategy do you prefer?</p> <p>Answer 5: Option A - meeting assessed housing need on the understanding that the housing stock created is local people to own or rent not for speculators.</p>	<p>Comment opposing large scale development within the Green belt noted. Answers to specific questions posed also noted.</p>
45657281	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5	<p>Question 6: What are your reasons for selecting this spatial strategy option?</p> <p>Ignores the fact that the local infrastructure cannot support further development</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42616033	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>I would like to voice my objections to the proposed buildings.</p> <p>I object to all these plans for more houses in the Borough as proven through the summer we dont have enough water for the houses we already have, so adding more will just cause more damage to the infastructure. The traffic coming through Borough Green is a nightmare now let alone when theres thousands more houses built! I also do not agree with keep getting rid of agricultural land or green belt at this rate there will be no countryside left to enjoy! The massive strain we have already on Drs and schools is terrible adding more housing wont benefit that! At the rate we are going we will just be one large city where there will be no more villages. As for the style of houses they keep building they dont even attempt to keep it the same style thats been built around it its everything for cheapness to keep the profits rolling in.</p>	<p>Comment relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
46051873	0 1.1.1 - 1.1.5		
42016897	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>The an needs to address homes for keyworkers there is due to the high costs of properties a recruitment crisis in health and social care. Real and honest affordable housing linked to lower salaries would no doubt support recruitment as would a properly funded key worker scheme.</p>	<p>Comment relating to affordable housing noted.</p>

42107457	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	I totally understand the need for more homes but I do ask that the village and green areas can be protected from total take over by homes leaving nothing but a never ending sprawl of bricks and mortar	Comment relating to green space protection noted.
42715969	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	the plan considers many factors but if the money is not available any plan will fail and not meet its expectations	Comment noted.
25315361	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	Despite the fact that the previous plan was withdrawn, the Council should still ensure that they address the questions raised by the Inspectors in their anticipation of the Stage 1 hearings. For example:-  "Why are there no housing allocations proposed in Walderslade, Snodland or Hildenborough? Why are allocations proposed in only 6 of the 28 'Other Rural Settlements' identified in policy LP5?"	Comment noted. The council will prepare background evidence to provide detail around the settlement strategy adopted.
42722209	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	We need to have a needs driven plan not one that purely divides up a number of houses around the country. An analysis of the needs of the population of the Borough should be assessed and the plan should then address the associated number of houses and the supporting infrastructure and facilities. Without this assessment there is a real danger that the borough become the victim of an inappropriately set targets which destroys the essential character of the area to the detriment of its population and visitors. We should robustly challenge the targets that have been set.	Comment noted.
42519041	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	It is accepted that an up to date local plan is necessary, however, the proposals for Wateringbury are entirely unsuitable. Existing infrastructure is barely able to cope with existing homes/businesses. It is unviable to propose the extensive building. The heavy traffic that uses the crossroads at Wateringbury has resulted in this being 24% over capacity; increased also by recent developments in Maidstone and Paddock Wood areas. These same crossroads are the most polluted in Kent. Wildlife, hedges and open space will be lost. The surrounding narrow, single track, unlit lanes will become gridlocked. How are our GP, school and transport facilities expected to cope with any increased population? We are currently subject to a hosepipe ban, where would the water come from to service new homes/businesses? Sustainability in the area outweighs the minor considerations that are being inputted into the local plan. What is 'Evidence including Infrastructure	Comment relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42768321	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	Delivery Plan?'	Comment noted.

42196033	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>I am strongly against building on the site in Fields lane and the main Tonbridge Road on the A26 in Waterringbury. This proposed site is the only view of the beautiful Medway Valley and the jewel in Waterringburys crown. Not only will it take away the wonderful view but will join our village to Teston (which comes under MBC) and on this valley section of the A26 which will make it one continuous village. Each day in the working week in the rush hour we have queues of traffic on the A26 from the centre of the Waterringbury sometimes a mile back to the Teston Bridge making our village the 2nd most air contaminated section of road in Kent.</p> <p>No mention is made of the financial challenges facing local authorities given likely reductions in central government funding.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42794625	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1		<p>Comment noted.</p>
42835041	0 1.2.1 - 1.2.3	<p>6 weeks is not a suitable length of time to allow residents to find out about it and comment.</p> <p>Kings Hill is not sustainable, please refer to sites 59797 and 59800.</p> <p>Impact includes but is not limited to the following:</p> <p>Loss of Kings Hill Golf Course including loss of local employment, bar, club staff and green keepers - Contrary to SA Objective 4</p> <p>Loss of enjoyment to golf members, including seniors, juniors and local associations using the club facilities contrary to SA Objective 5</p> <p>The site contains a body of water contrary to SA Objective 8</p> <p>The site is principally a golf course not agricultural land contrary to SA Objective 8</p> <p>The site expected to provide 1228 dwellings contrary to SA Objective 14 namely 100 dwellings. If a smaller site is being proposed it should be shared with the community</p> <p>Loss of restaurant and bar used by non members ( Kings Hill residents)</p> <p>Loss of a local business namely Growing Golf which supports local schools, parents and children on Kings Hill</p> <p>Loss of the above local amenity - which formed part of the original planning consent</p> <p>Loss of public footpaths</p> <p>Loss of bridle way</p> <p>Loss of good quality farm land</p> <p>Protection of local habitat.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife including badgers and deers.- contrary SA Objective 6</p> <p>Loss of the scenic views to the River Medway and beyond - contrary SA Objective 6</p> <p>The majority of the site would not be within 800m of the existing health care facility which is unable to cater for the existing demand.</p> <p>The majority of the site would not within 800m of a school</p>	<p>Comments on the length of the consultation period noted. This is in accordance with statutory requirements.</p>
42442561	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4		<p>Comment relating to Kings Hill golf course noted. No decisions have yet been made on sites for identification or inclusion within the local plan. This matter will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.</p>

		<p>Nobody wants to see our younger generation have the attainment of owning a property unattainable. But it is vital that that Whitehall takes into account the major changes afoot in the world of retail. Like it or not consumers are moving away from the High Street and onto the web. We cannot stop this nor affect this 'drift' by titillating the 'shopping experience'. Given time we will be 'awash' with empty retail properties in town centre locations. Build here.</p> <p>With skill these can be transformed into very attractive residences be it houses or flats or penthouses etc etc etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new town centres evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42617505	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>Leave all other areas untouched.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42808577	0 1.3.1 - 1.3.4	<p>The plan for Mereworth would create a massive increase in commuting and school traffic which local roads couldn't bear</p> <p>!6 Viability is imperative here. Don't plan to build on known flood zones without drastic mitigations. Also consider the knock on effect of homes in existence.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42684641	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>A plan is needed as a road map for developing infrastructure and the provision of local services. It appears that the priority has been built build with little attention to impact on local services and infrastructure we need a break period to consider the current impacts and address the shortfalls.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42016897	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	<p>This needs to change we have been badly let down an example is the shocking appearance of McDonald's on Hermitage Lane we had been misled believing this was to be accessible housing linked to British Legion another is the constant piling noise coming from Pannatone development this is just not acceptable</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42016897	0 1.7.1	<p>Yes, an up-to-date local plan should be fashioned but not rely on continued building at the expense of the Greenbelt. We are facing vast amounts of change brought about by a rapidly changing climate and just cannot continue building, building, building with immense pressure on natural resources, such as water, power the support infrastructure such as Doctors, Hospitals, Schools etc, and an ever increasing risk of flooding in the Borough.</p>	<p>Comments relating to Green Belt and infrastructure provision noted.</p>
42756225	0 1.4.1 - 1.4.2	<p>Everything in the plan should be subject to planning approval and checking. You need to sort the infrastructure out on our area before you think about building thousands of new homes. It needs to be sorted around Borough Green, Sevenoaks and Tonbridge.</p> <p>The traffic is already horrendous. There are not enough schools, doctors or leisure areas.</p> <p>Sevenoaks wants to build a couple of thousand homes behind Greatness and there are a couple of thousand new homes that have sadly been allowed to be built in Paddock Wood.</p> <p>So if you are allowed to build all these homes, it will become a city here which is not acceptable. It's the green belt. It's the countryside.</p>	<p>Comments relating to infrastructure provision noted.</p>
42362561	0 1.5.1	<p>Go and sort out all the derelict buildings in towns and let people buy property there!!</p>	

38618241	0 1.5.1	How will the plan be monitored? What will be the frequency of reporting on progress? Will the plan be reviewed and flexed periodically?	Comment noted. The local plan will include monitoring and implementation measures.
42684641	0 1.5.1	No homes can therefore be build on Flood Zone 3 as they have a 1 in 30 year chance of flooding.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new flooding evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
38377665	0 1.7.1	I and we on Aylesford Parish Council very much want that TMBC works with us, rather than trying to impose a disproportionate amount of building in the Medway Gap, to a point that there is likely to be little local green space left if we are not careful.	Comments noted.
42330785	0 1.7.1	PRish councils should be able to have a major input in the type of housing provided in their village/area. Rather than what a developer wishes to build	Comment noted.
42715969	0 1.5.1	Will this 15 year period factor in new roads , schools , doctors, water supply ?	Comments relating to infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42832929	0 1.5.1	In the 15 years life of this plan we will witness huge technological change: a move to hydrogen and electric vehicles; driverless cars; more mobility by car pooling and 'uber' driverless cars; solar power; off grid power use; wind power; etc. We will also see challenges of climate change and bio-diversity loss that will affect building design and infrastructure development during the period of the plan.	Comment relating to climate change mitigation noted.

		<p>Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation. These representations have been drafted with reference to the revised National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Planning Practice Guidance. Gladman have provided comments on several the issues that have been identified in the Council's consultation material and recommend that the matters raised are carefully explored during the process of preparing the Local Plan.</p> <p>Specific Areas of Consideration</p> <p>Gladman considers that a balanced approach to spatial distribution is preferred and most suitable to support the vision and objectives outlined by TMBC. To support this, West Malling and East Malling should be recognised as sustainable and suitable locations for development, where growth can be accommodated beyond the Green Belt. In an area that is already highly constrained by Green Belt, Gladman consider that the boundaries will have to be robustly assessed to ensure that where land that can be released to meet housing needs, it is done so. Gladman disagree with the option to include a strategic gap/anti-coalescence policy without the policy being suitably worded to ensure flexibility in the event the housing land supply falls. A policy that arbitrarily restricts sustainable development sites from coming forward will not be supported.</p> <p>The Interim Sustainability Appraisal, produced as part the plan making process, raises several concerns, largely related to the site-specific analyses of site 59807, site 59814 and site 59824. Gladman consider that inappropriate levels of harm have been concluded on the sites, particularly with regard to surface water flood risk, recreational green space and potential harm to heritage and landscape. The site submissions within this representation and the accompanying vision</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Green Belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. Site specific comments also noted.</p>
43629217	0 1.5.1		
42016897	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>I do hope that there is consideration for existing established communities and local residents are properly consulted particularly important with major works we have all experienced the impact of Ditton Edge on the local community. Standards of operation and management must be robust and include public health impact assessments and clear health and safety requirements regularly monitored and inspected</p>	<p>Comment relating to health and wellbeing noted.</p>
42616033	0 1.7.1	<p>The community and parish council do not support the proposals</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure and water evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42330785	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>The availability of water should be a major consideration and pollution levels The traffic is already horrendous. There are not enough school, doctors or leisure areas.</p> <p>Sevenoaks wants to build a couple of thousand homes behind Greatness and there are a couple of thousand new homes that have sadly been allowed to be built in Paddock Wood.</p> <p>So if you are allowed to build all these homes, it will become a city here which is not acceptable. It's green belt. It's the countryside.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42362561	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>Go and sort out all the derelict buildings in towns and let people buy property there!!</p>	

42617505	0 1.7.1	Excellent. Never mind waiting for a Local Plan. Act now to assist residents of Ditton in mitigating the disaster that is fast approaching at Ditton Edge.	Comment noted.
42617505	0 1.7.1	Noted and understood. All seems very reasonable. With the one caveat that I hope EVERYBODY is cognisant of the fact that we have a lot of retail space 'coming up'. Don't let's concrete over the fields now and then in 3 or 4 years time say "Oh! We had no need to do that!" or "What a desperately barren empty space our town centres have become."	Comment noted.
42443329	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	A knock on effect of house building in other areas already impacts on traffic through the crossroads at Wateringbury. Already an unacceptably high pollution area.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42716001	0 1.7.1	It is very important to consult the local communities and ensure that developments do not detract from their lifestyle or facilities.	Comment noted.
42442561	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	There is no evidence that Kings Hill can support an additional 1000 dwellings. The Highways Department may not have the resource to assess traffic flow as the vehicle movement is already unsustainable	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42716289	0 1.7.1	Too many villages are being turned into small towns ..... small villages in protected Green Belt should be retained as such and not turned in to mass new development.	Comment noted.
42718081	0 1.7.1	Involvement of as many various people/ businesses etc is very important.	Comment noted.
42544865	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	The current infrastructure is failing re A228 and medical facilities are failing it's patients. How will more houses help?	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
38330977	0 1.7.1	Hildenborough Parish Council would welcome this particularly when developing their own Neighbourhood Plan which is currently put on hold.	Comments noted.
42488033	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	Re viability and Kings Hill. Using the definition given in 1.6.1 already recent development is unviable because there is insufficient healthcare in place. For example, the GP surgery is already struggling to cope with the number of patients it is required to support.	Comment on Kings Hill infrastructure noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42617505	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	Tell us about it! The lack of a local plan has led to a complete failure to follow ANY of the 1.6.1 points in the Ditton Edge Disaster.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42460353	0 1.7.1	Building has just begun on the fields here. Can the Council please do something and act to prevent what is going to become the 'mother of all' infrastructure nightmares. Far far too many units and vehicles.	Comment noted.
42794625	0 1.7.1	A variety of views very relevant.	Comment noted.
42720897	0 1.7.1	Agree	Comment noted.
42806945	0 1.7.1	Neighbourhoods need to still exist after the p!An is implemented.	Comment noted.
42806945	0 1.7.1	Co-operation with local communities, through parish councils, etc. is right and important	Comment noted.
42808577	0 1.7.1	Please give weight to the comments from Mereworth Parish Council.	Comment noted.

42052833	42036737 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>The Council was forced to withdraw the earlier Plan as the Inspector found that it had failed in its duty to co-operate with neighboring authorities as required by the NPPF and in particular the need to meet the shortfall in housing provision in Sevenoaks district. (XXX)</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that any housing need not being met by neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. (XXX)</p> <p>This draft Plan is silent on what steps have been undertaken to co-operate with neighbouring authorities and how it is seeking to resolve the expected shortfall in housing provision at Sevenoaks. (XXX)</p> <p>In this context, the proposed provision of 839 dwellings per year must be regarded as a minimum until such time as it is apparent that Sevenoaks Council will be meeting its own housing needs in full. (XXX)</p>	Comments relating to OAN as a minimum noted.
42828705	0 1.7.1	<p>Your neighbourhood planning does not take into account anything to do with local people and their needs whilst living in our local area. We have been residents since 1965 and make use of all the facilities in our local area, which you seem to be ruining with your ideas with no thought for anyone living in this area</p>	Comments noted.
42729441	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>as for influences to the current plan I believe attention to what has been said in previous plans/developements needs to be concidered. We currently live on Kings Hill which was planned and sold against a plan. with green spaces, golf course , public facilities etc. I do not feel that these commitments should be undone by the new plan. Infact with a surgery which cannot meet current needs and transportation links that have not been improved adding to this area I believe is not the way forward. With the amount of housing required a new town should be thought about rather than adding two here five there which will only cramp an already cramped area which does not have all the required faciltities to an acceptable level.</p>	Comment relating to Kings Hill noted.



appraisal', it is clear these influences have significant negative impact within the area of Wateringbury.

Specific concerns re 59654 (Residential):

\* SGN have informed me this summer that the gas network is not a high priority for investment even though regular disruptions are experienced at the Wateringbury lights relating to 'spot' needs to replace the gas pipe as it is not sufficient for the village

\* To build on this site would ignore a considerable number of uncertain or certain negatives. Positives are potentially a school and railway, and that is it. However, these are only potential as the consultation documents are vague on capacity for education

\* The supporting documentation is too vague re conserving character and landscape. The village has green boundaries and this will be affected... not to mention additional traffic and infrastructure burden

\* The site is expected to provide fewer than 100 dwellings. It is expected that these smaller sites will not be able to offer as wider mix of housing or making as greater contribution towards local housing needs as larger sites would.

\* There are lines of sight from an important Grade II\* listed heritage asset to the proposed site. Being so close, this site would present a negative impact on cultural assets

\* The site has a significant negative being within 100m of AQMA

\* Any development would not be able to deliver Bio-Diversity policy drivers locally. Any Bio-Diversity Credit approach would need to remain in the village rather than in another territory and it is not clear how this can be achieved

\*

Site specific comments noted.

42787713 0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

Much of TMBC's area is covered by the protection against development afforded by Green Belt and AONB status. This has protected us all from urban sprawl, mainly from London, but also in this part of the Borough, it has given protection from possible developments in the neighbouring boroughs of Sevenoaks and Gravesham. Those boroughs could wish to expand the relatively new settlements of New Ash Green and Vigo Village respectively, impacting adversely on this corner of TMBC.

Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new Green Belt evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

42806945 0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1

Surely a majority of homeowners do not want further building next too or around their homes, in which case is this a case of what plan creates the most money gets pushed through

Comment noted.

42363585 0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2

		<p>As a Mental Health healthcare professional living and working in the local area I note that Sustainability includes people's Well-being. Well-being is defined by the World Health Organisation (2020) as "a positive state".</p> <p>When any of the proposed developments are considered further I would propose that healthcare professionals are consulted to not only support accessibility which is key to well-being as some of the proposed developments are along narrow country lanes, have no current public transport, or are sited on hillsides (or slopes) which therefore limits accessibility, with little or no social infrastructure but also the type of buildings to be constructed as our aging population, and those with a disability require accommodation that is fully accessible as well as accessible community access.</p>	<p>Comments relating to the role of health and wellbeing noted. This matter will play a central role within the new open space and recreation evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42807137	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>The consultation should also take into consideration the impact of existing communities, in particular rural communities where population is less as the land is farmed - an existing business, and evidence would be required why other existing developments such as business parks cannot be turned into housing as opposed to fields (rural business). The increased traffic along narrow country lanes will increase anxiety for all road users, therefore I would recommend sites have to be accessed onto roads that are main roads where cars pass two-way, not lanes which do not have a middle road line.</p>	
42745121	0 1.6.1 - 1.6.2 & Figure 1	<p>Regards influence on plan I wish to read, hear, see improvement of amenity in critical areas such as Wateringbury. Plan must ensure reduction in traffic, speeding, pollution and maintenance and improvement of amenity and no developments that worsen an already poor situation. 20 mph limit for Wateringbury in current 30 mph area is essential</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42444161	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>This process is not as simple as it ought to be, this will limit the amount of responses.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42180641	0 1.7.1	<p>Will current neighbourhood plans be taken into account as they do not appear on your Figure 1 Influences on the plan.</p>	<p>Comment noted. There are no made neighbourhood plans within the borough</p>
42637633	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>All are equally important</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42714273	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Some of the planned sites are clearly being used to make up the numbers. No rational planner would reasonably suggest some of the proposed areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
42519041	0 1.7.1	<p>Wateringbury is already built to capacity. Further developments would risk the merging of neighbouring villages i.e Teston, Mereworth and Kings Hill thereby taking away the separating green passages.</p>	<p>Comments relating to Waterinbury noted.</p>
42687073	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Having soldiered through this consultation I feel that it could have been made a lot more user friendly</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

42318689	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>It is a considerable task to take part in this consultation. I have tried to get other residents to take part with little success as even before they have reached this point (1.8) they have "glazed over" or switched off!! Surely a simplified version of this consultation could be made available to the public. I have now, including getting one other person involved, and up to answering Question 8, spent over 6 hours on this consultation! as at 30 Oct 2022.</p>	Comment noted.
42470433	0 1.7.1	<p>The local plan is making already built local homes worse and reducing quality of life for residents by building on beautiful green spaces where communities come together e.g. small green spaces on tower view in kings hill. These are a vital part of community life: children play games here, in the snow families sledge together here, people buy lunches from waitrose and sit on this green space and spend time relaxing or with friends. Your plans involve ruining these areas. I am for the building of new homes, but not at the detriment to current homes. Our home is one of those homes on the green and when we bought it, we called KCC and Liberty Trust to ask if they would ever build on that land to which they responded no they wouldn't, it was planned green space for communities to enjoy. You are taking away these spaces, planning to ruin communities and devalue homes.</p>	Comment relating to the value of green spaces noted.
42478721	0 1.7.1	<p>Parish Councils have little or no influence on developments in the area they represent. For years attention has been drawn to the fact that housing development and infrastructure should go hand in hand and I only need to cite the traffic chaos on the A20 and Hermitage Lane to show this just does not happen. Much greater attention should be given to this issue. Looking at planning applications in isolation and not embracing the effects on surrounding areas should stop.</p>	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42641409	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Having worked my way through the consultation documentation as best I can, I have to say that the scale of information included is overwhelming. I appreciate that local planning is a complex subject but I cannot see how TMBC can get a representative cross section of responses by taking such an unwieldy approach. I hope I am wrong, but I can't help feel that the majority of the respondents are likely to be older, retired individuals (such as myself) as these are the only people likely to have the time to take on the task of responding in a meaningful way. I have no doubt there are rules which ensure all the information has to be available somewhere but is its not possible to produce a shorter, more concise version which would stand a better chance of gathering a more representative response across the Borough?</p>	Comment noted.
38330977	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Hildenborough Parish Council has a keen interest in being involved in the development of the Plan and would welcome discussions prior to the formulation of aspects affecting Hildenborough.</p>	Comments noted.
38330977	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Hildenborough Parish Council has a keen interest in being involved in the development of the Plan and would welcome discussions prior to the formulation of aspects affecting Hildenborough.</p>	Comments noted.

42641505	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	you really need to structure this consultation better to get representative information. rather than reviewing the draft plan a statement, question, response setup would be faster and simpler.	Comment noted.
42723329	0 1.7.1	I really think the local plan has too much reliance on the Kings Hill and West Malling area, which is already bowing under the stress of the Kings Hill development. As a resident of Kate Reed Wood for the past 16 years I have seen and felt the additional stressors on this part of the borough. The Malling Road is now almost impossible to turn right onto during the day, with residents having to wait 4-5 minutes to exit Typhoon Road. The road noise has noticeably increased and the hours of noise has also increased. I regularly walk along the Malling Road and King Hill towards West Malling and this walk into the village is increasingly unpleasant and unsafe. Footpaths are being eroded by poor maintenance. Parking in West Malling has become very difficult and the sheer volume of traffic trying to manoeuvre and find spaces is increasingly dangerous, especially for the elderly population of West Malling. Conclusion: There is too much emphasis on the West Malling and Kings Hill area to fulfill government quotas. Developers are attracted to this area because it is seen as desirable and therefore there is more profit to be made. Don't ruin the West Malling area anymore. The local plan needs to include detailed provision for older people including care support and accessible housing. Extra care schemes that are fully integrated into local communities not large separate sprawling walled communities	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation. Comment noted. This matter will be reflected within the next Regulation 18 document.
42016897	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	I want to say that this consultation is all well and good but there is a resigned feeling amongst all I speak to that the decisions made by councillors out of touch means that whatever anyone says, they will not be listened to. You are paying lip service. NO ONE WANTS DEVELOPMENT ON TOP OF THE GREEN SPACES THAT MAKE TONBRIDGE SPECIAL	Comment relating to green space protection noted.
42044577	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	Residents who live in proposed areas of development must be considered with impact on our lives. Increased traffic already in Wateringbury from nearby developments.	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new transport modelling evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42443329	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	Why are areas being considered when they prejudice the interests of the community for example building on Kings Hill golf course The existing doctors surgery cannot cope with the existing demand Arterial roads cannot cope with the existing demand	Comment relating to sites and infrastructure provision noted.
42442561	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	Thank you for giving local residents this opportunity to comment.	Comment noted.
42794625	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2		
42715969	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	The concerns from us are the lack of resources, the destruction of the local environment , changing the settlement status of Mereworth that has been enjoyed by its residents . No consideration is given to improving the roads and schools , doctors to cope with the increased population .	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.

42719585	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>Kings Hill already has its own problems. Off street parking, general parking and some of the narrow roads, mews and road features already create issues for general driving let alone for refuse collections, delivery vehicles and, of course, emergency vehicles. Currently in play are some very draconian measures to supposedly assist with these issues by adding a ridiculous amount of parking restrictions, using double yellow lines to many roads making the parking problem even worse. These plans have been 'pushed through' by TMBC in a very underhand manner with little/no consultation of the residents with the vast majority strongly against these plans. And now it is being suggested that cramming more housing in to an already congested area is a good idea!</p>	<p>Comment relating to Kings Hill and infrastructure provision noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42770945	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>The key issue for everyone is Climate Change. If temperatures continue to rise and we have regular droughts and floods this will devastate communities. Farmers need to adjust NOW for this eventuality and the plan should accommodate this instead of mythical housing needs - if life becomes difficult there would be a mass migration anyway. Look at the problems farmers faced this year!</p> <p>Water availability Will be a problem with so many more developments needing water and sewage - where will it come from?</p> <p>Roads will be unable to cope with Increased traffic problems and cause immeasurable pollution - which will only increase the onslaught of a warming world - despite the increase in electric cars.</p> <p>please, please do not be blinkered by out of date Government policies in your plan. Think outside of the box and what future there will be for our children in 20 years time.</p> <p>You need to create Green businesses ie. rewilding firms, Tree planting firms that pinpoint small areas ( ie gardens), sustainable organic farms, affordable housing on brownfield sites, massive insulation programmes , green energy ( solar, wind etc), Green transport with electric buses - excellent cycle routes properly connecting our towns and villages, fleets of cargo bikes to deliver goods.. etc. Etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new infrastructure delivery plan and climate change evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42778017	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>One of the key issues is to reverse the decline of our high streets. Of course, this is a national issue and not confined to this borough and I do not see any fixes either now or in the longer term.</p> <p>1.7/8 Building this no of homes is controversial . Getting backing from the population is a good idea but information needs to be clearly laid out i.e. OS Maps with plots highlighted rather than these nos. out of no order in long columns too time consuming for people to understand easily without a lot of time.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new town centres evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.</p>
42684641	0 1.8.1 - 1.8.2	<p>time.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>