Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC responses
42080705	•	Table 9 - List of O Sites - Trench	Strongly object to the future consideration of sites 59835, 59798 and 59521 for development. In respect of the first two sites, Frogsbridge Wood and land to the north of Elmhurst gardens, these sites are completely detached from the settlement by mature wood land. This land has a high landscape and amenity value to residents and is poorly suited for new development being so far away from the town centre's shops and services. The poor bus connections would inevitably mean future occupants are heavily reliant on private cars. Much of frog bridge is recorded as ancient woodland and any development here would wholly conflict with national policy's requirement to not harm ancient woodland. The remaining land does not relate well to the development pattern of the settlement and would be seen as a harmful intrusion into high quality open countryside. If the release of Green Belt is to be considered it must be informed by thorough landscape character analysis to ensure countryside of the highest landscape value is protected, like these sites.	raised will be taken into
			In respect of the Quincewood gardens site, there is no need to develop a much-needed open space when suitable land exists in the form car parks and brownfield land in the town centre. This is a well-used space for recreation and the benefits of delivery a few houses would mot outweigh the harm from the loss of open space. Much better sites can be found elsewhere.	
39125921	(Table 9 - List of Sites - Trench	59521 - Quincewood Gardens Green is often used for air ambulances to land serving the area in emergencies. I nere is a general tone of anti-development expressed through the question and reports. I his is wrong and will actually lead to economic decline and decline in the community dealing fairly across the wealth ranges. Compassionate conservatism should address:	Comment noted.
			* the disadvantaged and not just protect the status quo. * Encouragement of industry, economic development and small business. * Address concerns related to climate change.	
			The settlement hierarchy is not well constructed currently and does not reflect the connectivity advantages of some communities over others. Specifically Hadlow and East Peckham are not the same as Hildenborough and Borough Green. Development should go where the communication links are good as a priority. Hadlow and East Peckham should be moved down the hierarchy into a new category.	Comments noted. The site specific matters
45634817	(Table 9 - List of Sites - Trench	There is no vision for what future transport systems should be like and without a vision this will drift and be driven by market forces rather than being planned and developed. The policy should encourage greater use of public transport and more flexible responsive service by hired transport options. Car ownership which is currently reducing should be encouraged to do so and internet connected self-driving vehicles should be favoured. Slower speeds will enable carbon saving and greater safety and maximise the use of our existing infrastructure without adding to congestion.	
			Variable pace maximising road space can be achieved by automated gps related driving to optimise road use at low speeds. This will also help cyclists without requiring infrastructure changes. Delivery vehicles should be optimised for final mile delivery using a licencing system to diminish duplication. This could be operated on a local regional basis influenced by local government in a similar way as taxis. Responsive hire systems such as Uber should be encouraged to use self driving automobiles with optimisation derived form use patterns set by the public using tracking data.	
42044577	(O Table 9 - List of Sites - Trench	The countryside has suffered a fall in numbers of residents and planning should try and resist this by providing Awful proposed sites	Comment noted.

42262977	O Table 9 - List of Sites - Trench	This is a very important green space to many local residents, both young and old. The space is used by children to play and by walkers of all ages.	Comment noted.		
		I would like to comment on list of sites, that are under consultation for future planning.			
	Table 9 - List of	I agree that we do need to build more homes and there is a serious shortage of affordable rented accommodation, and need for more social housing. The areas that are marked for consultation are all a environmental concern, of losing green belt land, and current infrastructure of roads and services that are already overwhelmed!	Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into		
42761377	Sites - Trench	The area at bishops oak ride would remove 7 mature oak trees, this would be devestating, and a huge impact from the building of only 8 houses. I also understand that the trees have current TPOs. I would also disagree if other proposed site at Quinswood Gardens this is a essential play area for local children to play on.	consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.		
		The only place I feel would be suitable would be coblands. This would give the most number of houses and least impact of infrastructure.			
		Further to your e-mail below, regarding the subject line consultation that closes on Wednesday (3rd Nov. 2022). With reference to the attached, we have provided our comments on the emerging Local Plan. This letter provides our responses to the consultation questions.			
	Table 9 - List of O Sites - Trench	We welcome the opportunity to help shape the strategic future development and local policies, but we hope our concerns and comments will be duly considered. I also hope you take time to read my e-mail below, about our particular local development concerns and the wider issue of the retail/office to residential conversions in our town, under Permitted Development Rights (PDR).			
24925793		Living in south-west Tonbridge, we have deep concerns about the lack of adequate highways capacity. I have previously been very disappointed that the Council continually appears to disregard the concerns of locals, about the current congestion problems/capacity issues, with approving more and more developments; and now even more unsustainable Green Belt housing sites are being considered here, as part of further urban expansion. Note housing need alone is unlikely to outweigh the harm and so cannot be used to justify exceptional circumstances.	Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the		
		As you are aware, from the various recent planning applications, approved by the Council (incl. land north of Lower Haysden Ln, for 125 new houses); the Brook Street/Quarry Hill junction is operating above practical capacity (>95%, as KCC Highways have previously acknowledged), even before this outline planning application was approved.	site analysis and site selection processes.		
		However, since then plans to extend Judd School have been approved, which will generate more peak-time school traffic, so the junction will now have to cope with something like 120% of its capacity. To compound matters, there is a lack of local primary school places, so the 125 new houses will put further pressure on local services/schools (especially as this site no longer includes the much-needed new primary school). Due to the lack of local school places, parents will have to take their children to other schools, across Tonbridge. This will likely promote more private car journeys at peak time, as cross-town school trips are not conducive to active travel and so cycle-paths improvements will do nothing to mitigate this impact. This will add to the congestion problems in our town, plus likely worsen air pollution, none of which can be considered sustainable development.			