

Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC responses
			<p>Sites 59550 and 59552</p> <p>I am appalled to hear that there is a consideration for planning on the play area in Brindles field.</p> <p>This is beyond disgraceful to even be considered.</p> <p>With mental health high on the agenda these days taking away recreational areas will only increase this.</p> <p>This would mean this end of town would have no play areas for children. You cannot include haysden as a play area it is too far for children to go alone down a country lane and children often play in Brindlesfield without parents.</p>	
42329793		Table 9 - List 0 of Sites - Judd	<p>We were on the understanding there was a preservation order on the play area? Although that means absolutley nothing to Tonbridge and malling. To build on green belt land was as low as I thought the council could get but obviously not.</p> <p>Money is clearly more important for the council rather than the well being of residents.</p> <p>We have lived here since the houses were built and part of the reason for buying in this area was the layout Infront our house rather than other houses and a view !! All if this would be taken away and devalue our property as estate agents say our houses go for more than the rest of the estate because of the view we have. This would mean you would devalue our house .. disgraceful.</p> <p>Surely there are other areas within the town that are less of an impact on people's well being.</p> <p>If you genuinely care about people in this town I do hope this ridiculous proposal will be rejected.</p>	Comments noted.
42329793		Table 9 - List 0 of Sites - Judd	<p>Sites 59550 and 59552.</p> <p>This area is crazy for parking space as it is with the college parking etc there aren't enough areas to park as it is. This would make the situation impossible for parking spaces.</p> <p>[Sites 59550 and 59552]</p>	Comments noted.
42557985		Table 9 - List 0 of Sites - Judd	<p>I wish to object very strongly about Brindlesfield Play area being included in the local. This play area is much used by local children. It gives them a chance to run around, play hide and seek. Use the equipment. A vital exercise. Families take picnics in the summer months and sit on the grass. Also blackberry picking is enjoyed in an enclosed area.</p>	Comments noted.

[Sites 59550 and 59552]

I have now found out the potential plan for the play area would be flats!!

This would be beyond ridiculous Infront of our houses we would have no day light and it would block any sort of view!!!!

To even put this on a list for consideration is beyond madness to build so close to residents homes.

42329793

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

South of Tonbridge will end up gridlocked if you continue to squeeze properties in.

Comments noted.

We have lived in this house since they were built in 1990 and have always appreciated Tonbridge but the council will make this town just a cramped stressed place to live.

It's about time councils started looking out of towns instead of cramming everyone in one area creating traffic, pollution, issues for parking, and mental health if play areas go .

I do hope this is reconsidered very soon and taken off the list.

Re 59745 - This proposed site is completely inappropriate for development. It is currently fields and footpaths which attract a great deal of biodiversity. The housing stock below it in Oaklands Way and Hilden Avenue benefits from this site acting as a sponge to remove / store vast amounts of rainwater which soaks through the fields and runs downhill toward the housing, this can be seen flowing through gardens at times of heavy rain, any covering over of that capacity would likely have a sever detrimental effect on the properties in Hilden Avenue and Oaklands Way through increased water flow. My house already suffers from subsidence related to the clay base, any change in the way water is managed in this area has the potential to have a huge impact on the stability of the ground and housing mentioned above. The drainage in the area is already regularly overwhelmed having been installed in the 1930s it is not suitable to carry an increased flow of sewage water from additional housing.

42585473

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

The presumed road access point to any development would be through Hilden Avenue, this is again not a suitable access for additional cars to join the B245 which already operates at high capacity in the peak hours, joining the road is dangerous and any increase in vehicles attempting to do this is likely to cause accidents / pollution whilst idling waiting to join a difficult / unsafe traffic flow.

42676193

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

I am against any building of housing in the areas Site 59550 and 59552 as my 2 children age 6 and 3 play here with their friends. We are by some very busy roads and this is the only area in which they can safely play. It is also a beautiful natural environment for nature lovers.

Comments noted.

[Sites 59550 and 59552]

We have been made aware of potential plans to target the Brindle Field play area for housing developments.

42676673

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

This is one of the few local adventure play areas for children. It's incredibly popular with families, both for its great play equipment for all ages and its proximity to nature. Most playgrounds are overbuilt, with roads and housing surrounding them. This is one of the few areas that offer children an experience of the past with direct access to woodlands and not just overly cultivated trees and shrubs.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

I appreciate the government has set ambitious targets on building houses, but not at the cost of our children and the environment.

I hope you will consider other options and decline the possibility of building in this area.

42705057

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

Regarding site 59572. This is noted as a protected open space on your current local plan so how can this possibly now be listed as a possible development space? What is the point of the protected open spaces if you can change them anytime? I object to this site being used for housing

Comments noted.

[Site reference 59550 and 59552]

I am emailing as a resident of Swanland Drive, TN9 2RA, to complain about and oppose the proposed development of the above housing projects around Brindles Field.

We have nowhere else local for our children to go play without having to get in a car with them, and this has been a huge source of our child making local friends, and us meeting other parents.

42707649

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

We recently got rejected from getting a place for our child at Sussex Road, and being the closest school, how can you even begin to consider putting more homes up when we are already so overcrowded with houses we can't get into our local school.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

I plead with you to not push this through. It will be a devastating loss to the area, and its sense of community.

If there is anything else more official I need to do this please let me know. And please can you confirm receipt of my email?

[Site reference 59550, 59552, 59571 and 59572]

I write with regard to the potential development of local open space at sites identified as 59550, 59552, 59571 and 59572.

Any development of these spaces would have a severe impact on existing housing and would result in encroaching on houses already in existence.

Part of the appeal of this area is that the estate has these open spaces of green with trees and other foliage which not only make the area more attractive but also provide areas for children to play safely.

There is also no way that the local roads could cope with the inevitable increase in traffic nor would there be sufficient schools, dentists, or GP surgeries.

I therefore strongly appeal against any development of the open spaces as identified.  
[Site Reference 59550 and 59552]

Hi

Please save my local playground as it's the only one in my estate. My kids still use it frequently, we also meet other children there and our friends with school age children... they don't have any other playgrounds nearby!

I don't agree with housing being built there... I'm sure there are more suitable sites than Brindles Field playground: site : 59550 & 59552  
[Site reference 59552]

I am writing to express my absolute disappointment and sadness to hear about these potential plans. I totally disagree with this and I want to voice my strong opinion.

The play area is a haven for all children in this area, how could you even consider doing this and taking this from them. After everything that happened during the pandemic, they need to be out there playing and having fun in this lovely park.

I have 2 children and we are most days in that park playing come rain or shine. The park is a friendly safe place for our community to meet up also also, do not take it away.

Not to mention the extra congestion on our already busy roads and the extra strain re the number of kids needing school places/ doctor appointments...etc

Please LEAVE our play area alone!

I reiterate, I strongly disagree with these plans.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments noted.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42708289

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

42088257

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

42727457

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

To make a comment on site 59641 in Judd Ward.

On point to improve human health and well-being - the health center and schools are not in a safe walking distance as there is no pavement. The lane is narrow in places for 2 cars to pass.

On point to protect and enhance the borough's landscape and townscape character and quality - the site would triple number of households in the hamlet and yet would not be part of the community.

On point to protect and enhance the quality of water features and resources - additional 29 properties with drives would not improve the water resources path they would create even more surface water issues in already poor water zone.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42802817

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

On point to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and climate change as the site is not within a walking distance to train station and bus stop that will encourage usage of cars for work, school and any other activities. The site is not on main drainage that will increase the traffic with cess pit lorries as well.

I also just wish that a real person should visit each site in the borough rather than look at the map and a bit of the proposal wording. They see with their own eyes if it is suitable, speak to local people to see what are the issues. Is that lane actually drivable for such increase in traffic ie 3 times more of cars.

Site 59552 and 59550 - Please do not build on this community land that is used by families. These are children's playing fields used by families. Removing such an open space for children and families would impact the community.

Sites 59572 and 59571 - I see these sites used by families (sports eg, football) and shared with wildlife (hedgehogs etc). These areas supplement the small gardens of the adjacent properties and enable families and wildlife to thrive. Although I do not live in the adjacent houses I consider it would be extremely detrimental to build over them.

Site 59641- Building on this site would simply increase traffic on a very quiet road, a stretch of road promoted by the council for the traffic free cycle route to Penshurst. If building happened here, there would need to be road and infrastructure planning to maintain the quiet traffic free cycle route enjoyed by many.

Site 59796 - This site appears to be on Lidl supermarket and its car park which are regularly used by the community. Such facilities should not simply be removed when they are regularly used.

Site 59838 - The location of this site raises the impact on the main A26 road between Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells, which is already desperately in need of redesigning to enable more efficient traffic flow for all transport. I suggest this is only considered if the road can be redesigned first.

Site 59869 - Safety of pedestrians need to be considered with this site, due to impact on access to Haysden country park.

Site 59765, 59764 and 59695 - All sites take away large areas of local farmland and open land significantly increasing traffic into existing traffic pinch points in Tonbridge. Grid lock at key times in Tonbridge from the obvious increase in car traffic and the consequent pollution increases for all in central Tonbridge. The infrastructure of the existing roads, schools, medical facilities in Tonbridge

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42814561

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

[Site reference 59641]

### 1.3 Land South of Lower Haysden Lane, Tonbridge (Site 59641)

#### Location and surroundings

1.3.1 The site within our client's control is located south of Lower Haysden Lane and comprises 5.5 hectares of part brownfield land. 1.3.2 The site is located west of the Tonbridge urban area in the south west corner of the settlement, approximately 1.7 km from the town centre. The majority of the land is undeveloped, however the northern section of the site accommodates a stable block and riding area. This operates as a livery and is therefore brownfield by definition.

1.3.3 With respect to site characteristics, the land is relatively flat, screened by planting along the east, south and west boundaries. The site is also well connected to the Public Right of Way (PROW) network, which circumnavigates the site. The majority of the land falls within flood zone 1, with the exception of the northern section that is flood zone 2.

1.3.4 In terms of surroundings, the site is currently bound by undeveloped land to the south and east, however it shared a boundary with a previously proposed strategic allocation. To the west of the site is the Lower Haysden Conservation Area, which contains a number of listed buildings. It is considered that any impact on the significance of designated heritage assets would be negligible, with any limited harm mitigated with good design.

1.3.5 With respect to in principle constraints, the land is located in the Countryside and the Metropolitan Green Belt. However, whilst we acknowledge the importance of protecting Green Belt land from inappropriate development, the site is in close proximity of the Tonbridge urban area and therefore represents a logical location to extend the previously proposed strategic allocation.

1.3.6 In terms of accessibility, the settlement is served by Tonbridge train station, which is located on the southern and southeaster train line offering access to London and nearby regional centres. The site also benefits from excellent surrounding road infrastructure, particularly the A21 and A26. Indicative proposals and supporting evidence

1.3.7 We enclose with this representation a vision document to indicate how development could be delivered and design rationale that is proposed for the site. This is included as Appendix 1

Site 59764: Flood Risk Comments: Small part of site is FZ2 and risk is likely to increase with climate change. If the site is allocated, mitigation will be required for the area within FZ2.

Site 59765: Flood Risk Comments: Small part of site is FZ2 and risk is likely to increase with climate change. If the site is allocated, mitigation will be required for the area within FZ2.

Site 59641: Flood Risk Comments: Majority of site is within FZ2. Risk will increase with climate change. More vulnerable forms of development should be restricted to FZ2 with appropriate mitigation to accommodate potential increased flood risk. Area of FZ3 should be restricted top open space.

Site 59815: Flood Risk Comments: Site is FZ3. More vulnerable forms of development should be at first floor or above.

Site 59576: Flood Risk Comments: The site is FZ2 and risk is likely to increase with climate change. If the site is allocated, mitigation will be required.

Site 59869: Flood Risk Comments: Part of site is FZ2 and risk is likely to increase with climate change. If the site is allocated, mitigation will be required for the area within FZ2.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The council is required to take national planning policy and other considerations into account.

Comments noted. The site specific flooding matters raised for these sites in the Judd Ward will be taken into consideration. All the sites have been screened to assess all forms of flooding including the impact of climate change which will be taken into account in the site analysis and site selection processes using the sequential and exceptions test in accordance with the NPPF.

43397313  
25240577  
Table 9 - List  
of Sites -  
Judd

25333345  
Table 9 - List  
of Sites -  
Judd

Judd Ward

All infill sites need to be first floor allowing for water to flow underneath and could be given to local builders 59641,59815,59576,59571,59572,59796 59550 and 59552. All sites with a Tonbridge train station and schools both within walking distance.

42684641

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

Site 59869 is too dangerous to be built on. It is nit that far from the barrier which came close to not holding a few years ago.

Sites 59764 and 5 are flood zone 3 and in places 1. All homes would need to be starting at first floor allowing for water flow underneath. Plant trees near watercourse and do not build on all the land . This area has a lot of water around.

Site 59838 is on higher ground in places and has good access to A21 and Tonbridge rail station and is within walking distance of the town given a footpath. TWBC are also considering a site near here so it could be very busy!

[59550, 59552, 59571, 59572]

I wanted to comment about the council's plans to build new housing developments on green land in the Tonbridge area. I live backing onto Brindle's Field so my comments are specifically about sites 59550 and 59552 but also relate to nearby sites 59571 and 59572.

These areas are invaluable as local open green spaces, enjoyed by local residents as a safe space for children to play, for walking dogs and simply to relax in. The Brindles Field play area backs onto many houses and flats and is much valued by myself and I believe most other local residents. I think local green spaces such as these are vital for people to be able to get out of doors easily and really benefit people suffering from mental health issues like myself or who are physically restricted to travel further afield.

42329665

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

The areas on the above sites are very compact and it is not at all clear to me how access roads would be built to accomodate them. From looking at the plans, it would seem local trees and bushes in front of houses at Brindles Field would need to be bulldozed to fit in the site(s). Further, building on these sites could only lead to further congestion on the roads trying to get in and out of the Tonbridge town centre, this has already become significantly worse in my view during recent years with the already substantial many developments in the area. I also believe the proposed new developments would put further pressure on schools local to the immediate area.

I understand the government are setting ambitious building targets and legislating councils to comply with these but I would really urge the council to look at building any further new housing estates on brownfield developments and in particular avoid green land like these sites or adjacently to existing significantly populated areas.

I believe that building on these green sites would be acts of both environmental and social vandalism.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.



[Site reference 59571 / 59572]

I am becoming very concerned over the amount of proposed building that is taking place within our town. The fact we are thinking of getting rid of children's play areas to build in my option seems outrageous.

44892577 Table 9 - List We seem to think it's fine to build new homes, but do we think about the bigger picture? Where will  
0 of Sites - children go to nursery, primary school & secondary school? Where will these people be able to  
Judd register with a GP (many are no longer taming new patients). Is there enough local services such as  
supermarkets etc. Does the environment cater for the extra volume of people? Can the utilities cope  
with the extra demand - gas, electric, water, broadband etc?

Comments noted.

Common sense seems to have evaporated now when it comes to building. Think about those who are less fortunate. Will it always be a wealthy family in that home? We need to stop building & think about the impact our over populated town is currently in.

[Sites 59550 & 59552]

I understand that there is plans for potential development to the above sites.

45444929 Table 9 - List I would strongly object to any developments on these sites.  
0 of Sites -  
Judd If the increased traffic on already busy small roads and increased population in the area along with  
the no doubt negative impact on values of existing houses was not reason enough, the loss of  
valuable green space and very well used social areas for the local community would be a travesty.  
Developing these sites would have a huge negative impact on the community and area as whole.

Comments noted.

I would urge and request that any plans to develop these areas are rejected.

[SITE REFS: 59550, 59552, 59571 AND 59572]

I'm very disappointed to hear about and am opposed to the above possible planning sites.

45607745 Table 9 - List These sites occupy valuable green community spaces enjoyed by families, enhancing community spirit  
0 of Sites - and the local wildlife. Development of either of these sites as well as loosing valuable green and play  
Judd spaces, will reduce wild life, increase pressure on local roads and schools, and will reduce community  
spirit and environments by compressing and cramming housing.

Comments noted.

Please do not develop these sites.

42044577 Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites - Awful proposed sites  
Judd

Comment noted.

42192193 Table 9 - List The idea that you will take away valuable playing space and allotments in this area is absolutely  
0 of Sites - absurd. My children have used this playground for many years and still use the football field beside  
Judd the park. This should not be built on.

Comments noted.

I wanted to comment about the council's plans to build new housing developments on green land in the Tonbridge area. I live backing onto Brindle's Field so my comments are specifically about sites 59550 and 59552 but also relate to nearby sites 59571 and 59572.

These areas are invaluable as local open green spaces, enjoyed by local residents as a safe space for children to play, for walking dogs and simply to relax in. The Brindles Field play area backs onto many houses and flats and is much valued by myself and I believe most other local residents. I think local green spaces such as these are vital for people to be able to get out of doors easily and really benefit people suffering from mental health issues like myself or who are physically restricted to travel further afield.

The areas on the above sites are very compact and it is not at all clear to me how access roads would be built to accommodate them. From looking at the plans, it would seem local trees and bushes in front of houses at Brindles Field would need to be bulldozed to fit in the site(s). Further, building on these sites could only lead to further congestion on the roads trying to get in and out of the Tonbridge town centre, this has already become significantly worse in my view during recent years with the already substantial many developments in the area. I also believe the proposed new developments would put further pressure on schools local to the immediate area.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

I understand the government are setting ambitious building targets and legislating councils to comply with these but I would really urge the council to look at building any further new housing estates on brownfield developments and in particular avoid green land like these sites or adjacent to existing significantly populated urban areas.

It is my belief that building on these green sites would be acts of both environmental and social vandalism. I sincerely hope the council will reconsider.

*Larry Stevens*

It would seem to make sense to infill these fields along Brook Street, but unless you build a doctor and dentist here, and a proper segregated cycle path along Brook street, you don't have any road space for adding to vehicle journeys along Brook Street! There are no shops at all here, so you'll need to build a supermarket. Sussex Road primary school is already oversubscribed, so another primary school would be useful too. The desire line for cyclists would be to Tonbridge train station.

Comments noted.

Affordable homes in this location would be wonderful.

The land by Lower haysden Lane could flood.

I would just highlight that South Tonbridge is flooded with housing and to add more into South Tonbridge would push the roads and facilities to the limit as they are already at maximum capacity.

Comments noted.

42329665

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

38539137

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

42791105

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

I am a resident in Quarry Bank, and myself and my family can easily walk to Brindle's Field play area from our house through some lovely woodlands which are between the 2 areas. The walk is a great one, not too long or too short, and the prize at the end is a little playing field with space to play, including some small football goals. My two sons love playing football there and we have often taken a ball to play as an easy alternative to the garden, with the benefit of fresh air on the way there and back too and without having to cross any roads. I am concerned that this area is being considered a potential area for new housing. I appreciate new houses need to be built for the government targets, and understand this consultation is asking for views on the principles to be used by the Council when deciding where to build. My comments are as follows:

1. This is a lovely open space, away from any busy roads, where local children can play safely. It will be a big loss to a large number of families who use it - from small children to teenagers. E.g. the teenagers of neighbours of ours use Brindle's Field as often the main Tonbridge park gets too busy and full over older teens such that they prefer the smaller area. As I say, my own two sons enjoy playing there too, and I was hoping that as they grow it is somewhere they can safely go to on their own. If houses are to be built, surely that will mean more families who will need more open space, and so using up the current open space will prevent that, which seems counter-intuitive.

2. If houses were built on this area, it would add to traffic in the surrounding roads, which are already fairly small, and create parking issues. Areas with sufficient parking for 1 or 2 cars should be a principle - which can be applied to this site and generally. Although Tonbridge station exists, not everyone uses the train to get to work or drop children at school, and the buses are unreliable. It is naive to think that families will not want or need at least one car wherever they live, and can exist on the current public transport alone, no matter how much families would like to use public transport more. Families need enough parking for at least one car.

3. Do the local schools, doctors and dentists have sufficient capacity to take on more houses in this ward? I am not confident they do. Given when we moved into the area we were not able to register

I am very much against the plan affecting the Brindles Field Paly Area to build two new estates. This will cause havoc with the local environment and wildlife, there is already too much foot traffic, noise, people walking their dogs and leaving their feces lying around, and crime.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42827553

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

43312833

Table 9 - List  
0 of Sites -  
Judd

More people on estates will be disastrous. A really bad idea and a resounding NO from me!!!

I live @ [Redacted] TN9 2 [redacted], have lived here 12 years.

No, No, NO.

Comments noted.