

Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC responses
			Having studied the consultation proposals, we wish to object to the following development proposals:	
			59761 [Downs & Mereworth]	
			59740 [East Malling]	
			59834 [Medway]	
			59630 [East Malling]	
			59634 [Kings Hill]	
			59631 [East Malling]	
42702881	0	Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway	59797 [Wateringbury]	Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
			59800 [Wateringbury]	
			59802 [Wateringbury]	
			59424 [Kings Hill]	
			59655 [Kings Hill]	
			We have particular objection to sites 59802, 59800 and 59797, and wish to express our extreme concern for the loss of green belt land and countryside as recreational use. These developments would also harm roads with quiet lane status and harm aquifer for streams. They are outside the boundaries of existing developments	
			Site ID : 59696, Behind Vauxhall Gardens,	
			Not favourable.	
			It is a green belt and we bought the house in Vauxhall Gdns recently just because of that. We moved from Lewisham to this to have greenspace around.	
42719649	0	Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway	Building this development in green belt will have an increase in pollution and will have adverse affect on wildlife.	Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
			Traffic: Even now we are facing delay to get on the pembury road during peak hours. After this development, there will be too many cars at the same time.	
			School: There is not enough capacity in the nearby school currently. How we will manage this?	

We would like to register our objection to the following sites: 59701 (10.79 ha), 9661 (7.11 ha), 59834 (63.39 ha).

Your own reports highlight the significant challenges in delivering these sites due to flood risk, impact to environment, detriment to green belt, and proximity to historical assets, all of which we agree with, and make it clear that these are simply not viable options.

In addition; one element that the reports don't accurately reflect is the non reversible damage that would be done to one of Tonbridge's key assets which is Postern Lane and the public footpath that runs along it.

42727329

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

As a lane resident we observe the large number of local Tonbridge residents that use this footpath through out the week, enjoying access to the open countryside that is right on Tonbridge's doorstep, stopping and taking in the number of historical houses that sit on the road.

Developing the above sites would irrevocably damage the character of this area, and materially impact the enjoyment and value so many of Tonbridge's wider residents take from this walk. We respect the need for development and growth, but if the recent pandemic and lockdowns have taught us anything, it should be to respect and cherish our local areas that bring so much mental well being to so many, and not spoil them forever more with industrial buildings.

It would be a sad day if decisions were made to prioritise putting a discount carpet warehouse or car garage in direct line of site of some of Tonbridge's most significant historical assets that have stood for 3-400years.

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

24986113 24986113

Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

My comment relates to Site 59660. This box does not allow me to submit my statement, so I have emailed it to you.

Comment noted.

We would like to register our objection to the following sites;

59701

59834

59661

As your own report highlights there are significant challenges developing any of these sites, in particular flood risk where sites 59834 & 59661 which are classed as valuable floodplain spend a good proportion of the year underwater as can be witnessed from various available aerial photos. These sites are also greenbelt, green spaces, full of trees (orchards & ancient woodland) which help counter the terrible environmental impact of the awful traffic on Hadlow Road/Cannon Lane/Vale Road. Traffic which would only be added to by any development in these areas on top of the severe challenges of accessibility for these sites.

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

42732929

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

The impact culturally (particularly from sites 59701 & 59661) for Tonbridge would also be irreparable as a result of the spoiling of an ancient lane which holds several historically important sites and listed buildings. As residents we believe that the Lane has contributed sufficiently already to the expansion of Tonbridge with the development of the Industrial Estate along the southern border of the lane to Vale Road. We would also like to note that the existing industrial estates have numerous unused/unlet units, so why the need to expand the commercial site into a currently productive apple orchard escapes us (site 59701). The Lane is also a well used footpath which is readily accessible for Tonbridge residents to escape the urban sphere quickly without having to drive and any further development on the Lane would only discourage its use.

We would like to finish by acknowledging the need for development and growth for the area but think it would be beyond a shame to spoil a unique, loved and special part of Tonbridge & Malling.

42834465

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

I do not see how access could be created to support a housing development in the field behind Vauxhall Gardens (site:59696) without impacting either the listed building or the copse which is under a tree preservation order. Is this really a viable site given the proximity to the A21, the gradient, access challenges and removal of hedgerow & woodland habitats?

Comments noted.

42833857

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

Infilling on 59554 and 59555 would destroy the unique local style and take away a valuable green space that is used by the local population and local school children for recreation. We should be enhancing these areas and a better use would be to plant more trees.

Comment noted.

[site reference

59834]

We feel that the plans for further development in the area is way beyond what the area can take bearing in mind the major development at Kings Hill over the years. We are setting out the reasons for our objections which basically apply to all these sites:

* 1 - Loss of amenity and recreational use of Ancient Woodland and all the environmental consequences of that. At a time when we are supposed to be planting trees in memory of the Queen you are planning to pull them down!

* 2 - We appreciate you have to build more houses in the region but surely there are many Brown field sites you can focus on before pulling down trees and digging up farmland.

* 3. Excessive increase in traffic levels which are becoming a major problem already. In particular Site 59761, adjoins a very dangerous section of the A228 and the Kent Street intersection – an accident black spot. The A228 is not big enough to take all this extra traffic. It is already difficult and dangerous for us to turn right onto the A228 from Kate Reed Wood due to the traffic.

* 4. As & when the permitted sites marked in purple are developed as well as sites currently under development, all services will be stretched to their limits: Doctors surgeries (now are critically short of doctors), as well as schools, water, drainage & other utilities. Also, where are all these people going to work?

* 5. We also object to the possibility that Kings Hill should be classified as a town for planning purposes. It is already at a critical point of over development after decades of continual building. Even the sites originally designated for offices have houses built on them.

* 6. The scale of sites 59740/ 59634/ 59630 in particular represents a massive and totally unacceptable level of over development.

We do hope that you listen to the people who are currently living in the area and who know the [59554] [59555]

43416833

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

* 3. Excessive increase in traffic levels which are becoming a major problem already. In particular Site 59761, adjoins a very dangerous section of the A228 and the Kent Street intersection – an accident black spot. The A228 is not big enough to take all this extra traffic. It is already difficult and dangerous for us to turn right onto the A228 from Kate Reed Wood due to the traffic.

* 4. As & when the permitted sites marked in purple are developed as well as sites currently under development, all services will be stretched to their limits: Doctors surgeries (now are critically short of doctors), as well as schools, water, drainage & other utilities. Also, where are all these people going to work?

* 5. We also object to the possibility that Kings Hill should be classified as a town for planning purposes. It is already at a critical point of over development after decades of continual building. Even the sites originally designated for offices have houses built on them.

* 6. The scale of sites 59740/ 59634/ 59630 in particular represents a massive and totally unacceptable level of over development.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

38430273

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

Sites 59554 & 59555 Tudeley Lane TN9 2JW

These are also small areas of green space fronting older housing developments The objections stated for site 59553 above also apply here.

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

43797345

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

We write to object to the call for development of the following sites :

59834

Comment noted.

Site 59834: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. We would object to any form of built development at this location

Site 59661: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. We would object to any form of built development at this location

Site 59885: Flood Risk Comments: Site is FZ2 and 3. Risk will increase with climate change. Development will require appropriate mitigation to accommodate potential increased flood risk.

Site 59644: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. We would object to any form of built development at this location

Site 59562: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. More vulnerable forms of development should be at first floor or above.

Site 59660: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. More vulnerable forms of development should be at first floor or above.

Site 59560: Flood Risk Comments: Site is FZ2 and 3. Risk will increase with climate change. Development will require appropriate mitigation to accommodate potential increased flood risk.

Site 59559: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. More vulnerable forms of development should be at first floor or above.

Site 59561: Flood Risk Comments: The site is within FZ3. More vulnerable forms of development should be at first floor or above.

Site 59879: Flood Risk Comments: The site is FZ2 and risk is likely to increase with climate change. If the

Comments and objections noted. The site specific flooding matters raised in the Medway ward including the objections 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.

25333345

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

[59660]

Introduction

This Statement forms part of the submissions on behalf of Milton Property Investments Ltd (MPIL) in respect of its Site at Tannery Road, Tonbridge.

The "Tannery Industrial Estate" site comprises a number of industrial buildings containing predominantly warehousing and industrial uses with some retail. Access to the site is from Sovereign Way. It is located within the town centre. The site is shown edged red below.

[Red line OS site map provided below]

44565473 24986113

Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

image

Context

The Site is allocated for residential-led development within the current Development Plan (Tonbridge Central Area Action Plan 2008). In 2008, the site had been assessed by the local planning authority (LPA) as being able to deliver around 100 new dwellings, as set out in the Tonbridge Central Area Action Plan

(TCAAP). The TCAAP helped to generate new investment in the town centre area and led to the redevelopment of new housing – which yielded a significant number of new dwellings over and above the level anticipated in 2008.

As part of the previous Local Plan Review in 2019/20, including the Matters heard at the subsequent Hearings at the Examination in Public, MPIL submitted documents supporting the Local Plan's 'building blocks' approach to new residential development within the town centre and other suitably sustainable 59644

The planning applications in the Red Hill area 59644 will also have adverse effects on the already congested junction with A26 and Bow Road.

[59834]

1) Loss of amenity and recreational use of Ancient Woodland.

2) Extensive increase in traffic levels which are already becoming a major problem.

3) Services put further under pressure and stretched to their limits. Doctors surgeries, schools, water, drainage and other utilities.

4) Loss of historical local identity by over development within the area.

To build anymore housing in South Tonbridge would be to the detriment of its current population. The roads, schools, doctors are already at saturation point, to add in more housing would be a step too far. Also there is no point in flooding Tonbridge with more flats as people do not want flats, already in Tonbridge there are lots of flats for sale. People need housing with space and i dont think South Tonbridge has the infrastructure to support any more housing.

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.

Comments noted. The local plan development strategy and associated infrastructure demands will be reflected within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Infrastructure requirements will be outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

44952833

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

44953665

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

42791105

0 Table 9 - List of Sites - Medway

42803329

0 Table 9 - List of
Sites - Medway

This comment relates to the area of land located behind Vauxhall Gardens that has been suggested for inclusion in the local plan. This is I understand unsuitable for development for the following reasons:

- * is the infrastructure in place locally to support the number of houses (60) previously proposed? More cars contributing to already congested traffic on the Pembury Road at rush hour. School places.
- * the protected copse does contain a water pool that very likely provides habitat to newts and other wildlife. Along with the hedgerows that run through the middle of the site.
- * The copse between number 1 Vauxhall Gardens and the pub is protected by a TPO. So without passing through the front garden of number 1, how will access to the site possibly be obtained?
- * access to the site - it was mentioned before that the road passing alongside the listed Vauxhall Inn will not be suitable for heavy plant to use or to be a busy through road to the new housing estate.
- * claims it is very near a health facility are incorrect as Tonbridge Cottage Hospital is not a walk-in facility. The nearest doctors surgery that was on Pembury Road has closed and relocated to the town centre.
- * its proximity to the A21 will mean noise pollution and poor air quality for prospective new residents.
- * firstly it is green belt land adjacent to an area of designated ONB
- * Is the land safe to build on, history of in the past being a landfill site?

Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Infrastructure requirements will be outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

I am sure there are other sites much more suitable for inclusion in the local plan.