

Respondent ID	Agent ID	Document Part Name	Comment (plain text)	TMBC response
42362561	0 Stansted	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and	Definitely no mass housing here!!	Comment noted.
42403873	0 Stansted	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and	I strongly object to proposals for building so many new homes. Local infrastructure cannot cope with this level of additional housing. Roads are already gridlocked on a daily basis. Ightham ward. Specifically 59707, 59880, 59751 and 59881. These sites are within the village area in an area of outstanding natural beauty and sit on Green belt land. These sites are not suitable for development based on the following criteria. * Loss of visual amenity - impact negatively on the visual amenity of the local village and area. * Highway safety - Walkways and pathways are not sufficient within the area to manage with increase in traffic and pedestrians. Traffic routes are already heavily congested and any plans to widen roads cannot be possible with a bridge over the M26. * Traffic generation & road access - local roads are not sufficiently able to manage the quantity of traffic that would follow any of these developments within the Wrotham area. Access into the area is by small local roads. Heavy vehicles are not able to access easily any of these proposed sites and would negatively impact on the day to day activities of existing residents. * Adequacy of parking / loading / turning - local roads provide insufficient parking for additional development. Local roads are not of a large enough capability to manage the process of house building and related machinery. * Loss of trees - this is an area of outstanding natural beauty sitting in a conservation area. Existing properties are not able to disturb trees so planned developments should also not allow for disturbance of wooded areas. * Layout and density of buildings - plans to build the number of houses proposed would result in a high density of buildings which would be in contravention of the green belt area.	Comment noted.
42378241	0 Stansted	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and	* Effect on listed building and conservation area - as detailed above, the area sits in a conservation area with listed buildings. Objection on the grounds of I do not believe that Wrotham and the surrounding area is a option for any large scale development . It is prime farm land. Is designated as nature area and a greenbelt. Current levels of traffic are causing major issues any further increase in housing will case major traffic problems (roundabouts , around schools , through the country lanes) a lead to increase pollution and noise levels . Any new major housing sites will result in the loss of Wrotham as a village	Comments relating to sites 59707, 59880, 59751 and 59881 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42323713	0 Stansted	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and	Re: Local Plan, Site 59735. I would propose that this site is not suitable for development because a) of the destruction of woodland at Frogbridge Wood and b) because of the proximity of the stream that backs onto the current Willow Lea estate and presence there under of underground tributaries. Building in this area would likely cause flooding of existing properties in Willow Lea and Elmshurst	Comment noted. This matter will be considered and reflected within the new evidence being prepared to support plan preparation.
42508577	0 Stansted	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and		Comment relating to site 59735 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

development in the ward to be known as Pilgrims and Ightham:

- * 59720
- * 59872
- * 59709
- * 59770
- * 59794
- * 59872

Each of these sites are situated not only within the Green Belt, but also within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan.

Development of the sites would contravene many of the NPPF planning policies which I have highlighted at the bottom of this page. Primarily the development of these land parcels would:

- * Create loss of Green Belt
- * Create the loss of and harm the AONB,
- * Would significantly increase traffic on already busy small roads
- * Would encourage and create urban sprawl
- * Over develop the small village destroying the unique character of a predominantly Grade 2 listed heritage asset thus would not preserve the RE SITE 59441 - DEVELOPMENT WOULD RESULT IN :-

1. LOSS OF SIGNIFICANT LOCAL ASSET AND IMPACT ON WELL-BEING.

2. HERITAGE IS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE GIVEN ITS CLASSIFICATION AS SCHEDULED LISTED ANCIENT MONUMENT, AND GIVEN ITS POSITION AT TOP OF HIGH GROUND IN OPEN COUNTRYSIDE WOULD BE OF LINE OF SIGHT OF ANY DEVELOPMENT, AND AS SUCH OPPOSED BY HISTORIC ENGLAND

Site number - 59770

I am against and contest the development of this site due to the following:

- Loss of green belt
- Overdevelopment of the historic village of Ightham.
- its impact on an area of outstanding natural beauty.

- there are many brownfield site options which are more appropriate for References 59707 and 59731 appear to be duplicated. The land in question is green belt, within the AONB, and is in productive use as grade 1 and 2 agricultural use, and therefore unsuitable for housing development

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59872, 59709, 59770, 59794, 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59441 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment noted.

42562305 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted

42587809 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted

42607809 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted

42199073 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted

(industrial/warehousing) for the following reasons:

1. It is brownfield previously developed land, having previously accommodated the Stocks Nightclub and Spring Villas.
2. The redevelopment potential of the site has been recognised previously, with permission having been granted for 65,317 sqft for a hotel and conference facilities, together with 349 car parking spaces. Furthermore, this permission remains extant.
3. Historic discussions with Council Planning Officers have been supportive of industrial/warehousing development on this site.
4. It is derelict scrub land, lying vacant, with no agricultural or other beneficial use.
5. It is highly accessible to the motorway and strategic road network, without any need for HGVs to go through towns or villages, with corresponding air quality and congestion benefits.
6. The site is opposite to allocated employment land (Nepicar Area West) and therefore the location is already considered to be acceptable for employment uses by the Council.

42606657 Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
42606113 Stansted

7. The site is within easy cycling distance from a number of nearby settlements, and a short walk to a small supermarket for sandwiches etc.

Comments relating to potenial employment site at 59611 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Local Plan # 59720, #59871 and #59709:
I object to this planning proposal as this is a greenbelt area, also near AONB and nearby heritage site.
There will be difficulty accessing this site as there is a ransom plot adjacent to the entrance on A227 and it is situated very close to the Dark Hill roundabout on A25 and there is an electricity substation nearby.
Any further development will directly impact on the traffic both on A25 and A227 thereby increasing poor air quality which will affect children attending Ightham Primary School.
This land should revert back to farming to meet the requirement of food sufficiency in Britain.

42650721 Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

If plans for Borough Green Garden City is given the go ahead, even in a scaled back version, there will be enormous strain on local infrastructure including roads, schools and primary care facilities.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42671617 Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

Site 59770 - I strongly object to the inclusion of this site in the plan. Any development on this site would have an unacceptable impact on traffic on the very small, narrow and historic Rectory Lane, while having a severe negative impact of the immediate conservation area. Infrastructure to

Comment relating to site 59880 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

There are several sites in and around Ightham which are wholly inappropriate for development.
I have been informed on the NPPF 21 framework and object on the following grounds:

- Loss of and significant harm to AONB
- Loss of and significant harm to Green Belt
- Urban sprawl between Borough Green and Ightham
- Borough Green urban sprawl into both Green Belt and AONB
- Damage to habitat, wildlife, country and farmland
- Overdevelopment of the historic village of Ightham

The sites are as follows:

- Ismays Road 59608
- Ightham Bypass 59872
- Darkhill Farm 59709
- Gravelands 59720

42701473 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

42606657 42606113 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

Support the redevelopment of Site ref: 59811 for industrial/warehousing, for the reasons set out in response to Table 9 - List of Sites.

Comments relating to sites 59608, 59872, 59709, 59720, 59871 and 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
Comment relating to site 59811 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Specifically looking at Leybourne.

59432 is right near where I live. I always see families out playing ball games, my kids love flying kites and playing games on the grass area. It is used by dog walkers.

A few key points:

1/ Parking on Woodlea/Little Oxley is busy enough already, where do you expect the cars to park for the new houses? A driveway for 1 or even 2 cars is never enough.

2/ During development, where are the lorries going to park? How much disruption to local residents? Noise, pollution dirt all contributing factors.

3/ I Work shifts, so noisy building work is going to impact my mental health.

4/ The encouragement to ride a bike / walk for sustainability isn't going to happen. More cars makes it more dangerous on the roads. I have a 4 year old who rides her bike, but she will be scared if the roads are more busy. It's busy enough!

5/ We moved to the area because of green spaces / countryside feel. If we wanted to live in a build up area we would live in London !!!

42717313 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

6/ Doctors - You cannot get an appointment, how would this be addressed?

Comments relating to site 59432 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42318689 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

It may appear that I have taken a "Nimby" attitude BUT I can only approach this section with local knowledge to provide my answers in question 8.

Comment noted.

42720033	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	59881,59880 and 59665 are strongly opposed, for reason of objection noted above in respect of 59830. This is a very inaccessible place - it will go down a road that can only fit one car wide to reach it from Back Lane and the amount of traffic generated by 37 homes, especially causing air pollution to arise while cars wait to let each other past to reach the drive way into the plot around the rows of cottages on either side of the drive way. If access is the other side of the house there - cars will be going back and forth right up to the garden of cottage there - with 37houses - that is at least 37 cars if not more going back and forth - increasing air pollution levels. This plot is an area of outstanding natural beauty and opposite a nature reserve which preserves a very delicate ecosystem for a native plant -as a nursery it is already very environmentally friendly and offers biodiversity and greenery amongst the flowers and plants it grows - inside and outside greenhouses and the open beds. It is difficult to see how housing would improve the soil - given the site is a nursery. It is very much a going concern - I am not sure why an existing good business would be turned over to residential housing. and it would presumably disrupt the other business down that drive way. It seems that it would be difficult to argue that it improved sustainability for the economy by changing it to residential. There is only a very limited bus service at the end of the road that mostly works during school times and is likely to be closed down - school children in this area essentially need cars to get to the school bus stops - where there is a bus or to get to school. The buses have been reduced and cancelled - so people living here have to have cars - and the access here is not able to cope with that many cars. It is not near a school or medical facility.	Comments relating to sites 59881,59880 and 5966 noted.
42722849	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	We are near Ightham Mote and further cars can cause problems with access to that house given the narrow single track lanes around here. Gracelands 59720 - 198 dwellings - There is already significant air pollution from the A25 which wraps around this site.	Comments relating to site 59680 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722657	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	This appears to have access onto Fen Pond Road which is a narrow, unlit road where traffic already goes too fast. There are no pavements for pedestrians and more traffic accessing this road would increase the dangers! Gracelands 59871 - 28 dwellings This site is on a slope which finishes below the A25 and must be a flood risk area. Pollution from the A25 is very high and this green area and trees creates a natural barrier to the houses in Fen Pond Road. This would be better developed as a nature reserve! The access is into Fen Pond Road which is a narrow, unlit road with limited pavement leading to the village and no pavements going the other way. It is also extremely dangerous as it is used as a "rat run" at rush hours and the traffic goes a lot faster than the	Comments relating to site 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722657	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	Dark hill Farm 59709 - Mixed use. Development of any sort on this site is absolutely unacceptable. It is Greenbelt and a vital wedge that divides Ightham from Borough Green. Pollution and congestion from the amount of	Comments relating to sites 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42722657	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted		Comments relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Site ID 59720 - There is significant air pollution and traffic noise from from the A25 which is demonstrably in excess of the recommended limits and which already affects the village adversely .The access from Fen Pond Road(which is already dangerous due to speeding.Further there are no pavements for pedestrians) is totally inappropriate leaving only the Borough Green road(lghtham). The volume of traffic using the A25 at the eastern end of the site gets gridlocked in rush hour.The BG medical practice does not have capacity for additional patients.

Site ID 59871 and 59872- The comments above for site ID 59720 also apply to these sites. The access to Fen Pond Road is even more difficult than the above site.

42589953 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, lghthan and 0 Stansted

Site ID 59709 - The comments above for Site ID 59720 also apply here. In addition the block of land represents the only gap/wedge of land between Borough Green and lghtham (two separate communities). lghtham By Pass 59872 - 3 dwellings. I don't know why this is put down as a separate application when it is just adding 3 dwellings to the 28 already put forward as Gracelands 59871. It is not clear where the access for these 3 houses would be - if onto the A25 it would be even more dangerous than access onto Fen Pond Road. This should be kept as a green wedge between Re 59830

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871 and 59709 noted, including in relation to traffic and pollution impacts. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42722657 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, lghthan and 0 Stansted

This is a totally inappropriate development. I was unable to shop in Borough Green last Tuesday because there was not a single parking space available anywhere in the town. With 3000 extra dwellings and at least that number of extra cars the place will be at a standstill. It would double the size of Borough Green. It would require two primary schools and an additional doctors' surgery. Is there provision for these? Travel for pupils at secondary schools is already chaotic and will only be worse - indeed it is not clear where they would go.

Comments relating to site 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42722913 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, lghthan and 0 Stansted

Re 59720 and 59709
These two between them will join up lghtham and Borough Green and

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59720 and 59709 noted, including in relation to the role of separations of settlements. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Site 59608 -Ismays Road

Ismays Road is mostly a single lane road. Parked cars impede the flow of traffic and it is not suitable or safe for further traffic as a result of more development

The proposed site is in an area of AONB and is part of the green belt and totally unsuitable for the density of housing proposed

Borough Green is the nearest shopping area which necessitates a minimum ten minute drive as walking/cycling is impossibly dangerous along the busy A227.

There are few places to park in Borough Green and the road system is already at breaking point

As far as I am aware public transport links are at best extremely sporadic.

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42723425

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

.....
to Sustainability Appraisal ("SA") Objectives have been abbreviated "SAO". Some of these issues have relevance to reference 59872 so please also consider in that context, as appropriate.

Environmental impact- The topography of the site is a very narrow farm track to a small farm field lined by woodland on a significant slope down to the A25 bypass. To replace the existing farmland and woods with a housing site of the scale proposed - more houses than currently line this entire part of Fen Pond Road - would mean very significant changes to the landscape itself in order to create an appropriate site (SAO 5). It would not be possible, as the SA suggests in SAO 5, to conserve or enhance the asset through design – the SAO 5 entry should be updated to account for this and the existing SAO 5 statement should not be considered a relevant consideration for the decision as the impact could only be a significant negative.

This development could not be built without losing the entire topography, shape and aspect of the farmland and woods on which it is proposed. It will also reduce the biodiversity and geodiversity, as well as reducing protection of soil resources and the character of the area as a result (SAO 5, 6 and 9). The scale of the site, including by contrast to the scale of the proposal, does not mean design will be able to mitigate these impacts to any meaningful degree.

The proposal is extremely close (<250m) to the curtilage of the Grade I listed St Peters Church as well as being on the edge of the Ighthan conservation area and is certain to have a negative impact in respect of both (SAO 7) as the essential privacy and tranquility of the churchyard will be significantly reduced by the loss of the farm/woodland buffer to the new development and (as a result of the landscape changes) the A25 bypass.

In light of the above, the development would therefore have a materially

Comments relating to site 59871 noted, including comment relating to the environmental impacts, Green belt, AONB and impact upon the conservation area. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42736321

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

I have sent in a separate paper document highlighting the site id's I have issues with

Comment noted.

42729441

Site number 59720, Graceland. Too many houses in a flood risk area.

Site number 59871, Graceland. Acceptable number of dwellings but again in a flood risk area.

Site number 59608, Ismays Rd. Too many dwellings in quiet rural area. Flood risk again.

Site number 59793, Borough Green Rd. Acceptable (4 dwellings).

Site number 59709, Darkhill Farm. Not enough information . Encroaches on the Green Wedge between Borough Green and Ightham.

Site number 59872, Ightham Bypass. Acceptable apart from flooding risk.

Site number 59770, Rectory Lane. Too close to recreation ground and it's very busy access. Too little information. Flood risk area.

Re proposed site 59770. 1 The development would require an exit onto the A25 which at this point in the road is considered an accident black spot. 2 Extra traffic would be created in Rectory Lane which is extremely narrow and would be used a cut through. 3 The sewage system is not fit for purpose and during bouts of heavy rain sewage overflows at the bottom of Rectory Lane.

and A25 Ightham. This site is set within the Greenbelt, AONB and near to the SSSI of Oldbury Woods. It would have a very detrimental effect on the area, both environmental and ecological. There are potential noise issues with businesses or homes on the proposed site. Residents and employees on the proposed site would have to rely on cars as the local public transport is extremely scarce and school buses overcrowded causing local parent's many problems. The entrance to the site would need to be onto the A25, as Rectory Lane is an extremely narrow, single-track lane. Opposite the proposed site, on the other side of the A25 is the layby and Recreation ground where many parents pick up their children from Ightham Primary School. Ightham Scout Hall and Ightham Tennis Club are also on the Recreation ground, meaning, there are lots of cars turning into the layby and recreation ground car park at that point. To have an entrance to the proposed site at this point would be dangerous. An increase in car emission's would also affect the air quality at the nearby Childrens play area.

Traffic from the Site would also try to cut through to the A227 Tonbridge Road through Rectory Lane, which is unsuitable for the purpose. Many people walk down the lane with dogs, or taking children to Ightham Primary School, as the lane is narrow and the way ahead is often obscured by bends in the lane, it would be dangerous to increase the amount of traffic using it.

The lower end of Rectory Lane, near the proposed site, suffers with poor management of surface water runoff, both from the field and from higher up the lane from the A 227 where the drains are often blocked with leaves. Despite this being reported, the drains are rarely cleaned out. The existing

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59721, 59608, 59793, 59709, 59872 and 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59770 noted, including in relation to transport and flooding issues. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42745025 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted

42591969 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted

42591937 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted

		<p>With respect to Sites 59720, 59871 and 59830 in particular: we are very concerned about the impact the development of these sites will have on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Not only would this contribute to loss of green belt space, but the increased traffic through the village of Ightham, on the A227, A25 and not to mention all the country lanes that are already busy with traffic would cause significant impact to the existing community and is a hugely disproportionate development in and around the existing villages. The existing road network couldn't support the increased volume of vehicles, not to mention the increase in noise, air and light pollution.</p>	
42746497	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted	<p>The small "green wedge" between Ightham and Borough Green would be lost and the historic village of Ightham would be severely impacted by so many new homes being built on this green belt land. Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt - the purpose of which is to protect the countryside and prevent urban sprawl. These developments would see loss of the Green Belt and we believe this should be protected, as well as the individual identity of the villages. This is a small piece of green belt left in Ightham that would be completely lost irreversibly not to mention the impact on the Site 59608</p> <p>Sir/Madam, I write with reference to the above site in your proposed local plan. I think it would be a mistake to pursue this site for development. We are in an area of both Metropolitan Greenbelt and AONB, both of which should be protected at all costs. I completely understand the need for affordable housing across both the county and country, but the local school is not very large, nor does it have the capacity to expand and support a burgeoning local community. Moreover it is crucial to the ecology that we conserve our green pastures as much as possible. As a local resident on this road, we have seen the negative impact on the lane when the A227 was recently closed for a few weeks at a time due to subsidence. Ismays Road struggled to cope with regular extra traffic, being the obvious cut through when the main road is closed. Moreover Ightham and Ivy Hatch retain the feel of a village, the likes of which are disappearing at a rapid rate</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871 and 59830 noted, including comments relating to the Green Belt and 'wedges' between settlements. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42758977	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted	<p>These sites, except the Nepicar and Marley sites, lie in AONB and all within green belt and therefore are heavily constrained against development in planning terms. The area does however need to be some affordable housing locally for young families and essential workers. Some of this could be provided by 59751. 59830 is a huge development and will clog up local roads, cause massive pollution which affects children in particular and lead *</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42770017	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted	<p>59720 Gracelands,</p> <p>* OBJECT</p> <p>* Site is on MGB and in an AONB. The village of Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of MGB is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl.</p> <p>* Development will mean loss of green wedge between Borough Green and Ightham impacting the individual identity of our villages.</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59751 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
25406465	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and 0 Stansted		<p>Comments relating to site 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

		59709 Darkhill Farm	
25406465	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>* OBJECT</p> <p>* Site is on MGB and in an AONB. The village of Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of MGB is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl.</p> <p>* Development will mean loss of green wedge between Borough Green and Ightham impacting the individual identity of our villages.</p> <p>59608 Ismays road</p>	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
25406465	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>* OBJECT</p> <p>* Number of houses is too high for road infrastructure (a very narrow lane</p> <p>Site nos: 59880,59881,59881,59707/59731,59680,59705,59681,59593,59600,59611, 59643,59711,59788,59665,59706, 59882,59883, 59671,59794,59770,59709,59793,59872 and 59871.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42745889	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>For all the above sites, I object to their inclusion within TMBC's Regulation 18 Local Plan for future development for residential or Employment categories I have significant concerns and am opposed to development regarding site 59871 and site 59872. These are in areas of green belt and AONB, but more crucially they frame the Grade I listed St Peter's church as you travel along the A25. Building in this location would harm the setting of the church and diminish its position. They are also very close to the road so risk traffic collisions and will have poor air quality. Ightham is a small village and such a large number of new houses would be detrimental to its setting as a conservation area.</p> <p>I am also very opposed to sites 59720 and 59709. These propose a significant number of new houses on a busy stretch of road, risking traffic collisions and poor air quality. They will also significantly impact the setting of the conservation area and loss of character of the village of Ightham. The boundaries between Borough Green and Ightham will be blurred and impact their positioning, not to mention the loss of green belt land. Also, these areas have lovely walks that we go on with our children's showing them the horses and walking the bridle routes which will be ruined by overdevelopment. Their combined impact would also significantly increase traffic along the A25 which is already at a standstill during rush hour. I would also question whether local infrastructure can support such a large increase in housing, particularly the (already poor) broadband, water supplies and electricity.</p>	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42771425	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted		Comments relating to sites 59720, 59709 and 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

		Gracelands 59720	
		Gracelands 59871	
		Dark Hill Farm 59709	
		Rectory Lane 59770	
42773729	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>These sites are all next to each other and development would see loss of Metropolitan Green Belt, create a very built up area of 200-300 houses which would be considerable over development and ruin the village of Ightham. The infrastructure would not be able to cope with this size of</p> <p>Totally understand need for UK housing requirement, but Ismays Road and the Ightham area is not appropriate for development. Coach Road, a country lane in the area, is now used as a regular A road. The traffic is constant and terrifying. The verges, surface and gullies are suffering. Local people cannot walk on this road, or surrounding lanes, without danger. It is extremely upsetting. This area cannot cope with any more vehicles or the accompanying road rage. The nearby schools are full. The GP surgery is overflowing. The area is an AONB and an historic village. It cannot cope with development of this kind.</p> <p>Ref site: 59830</p> <p>See above comments.</p> <p>Ref site: 59720</p> <p>See above comments.</p> <p>Ref site: 59871</p> <p>See above comments.</p> <p>Ref site: 59709</p> <p>See above comments.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709 and 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42779329	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	See above comments.	Comments relating to sites 59608, 59830, 59720, 59871, 59709 and 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42780257	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	I don't believe any green belt or area of natural beauty should be touched. Thats the reason why people have moved here, It shocks me that some of these suggestions have been put forward. The identity of our village and local	Comment noted.
42786593	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	59608 (https://www.tmbc.gov.uk/downloads/file/2702/site-59608) Ismays Road, current transport and infrastructure does not support a development of this size, this would significantly change the village and put too much	Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

- * 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 Watringbury 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

42787713 Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

Only a fair accessibility band... not a minor negative due to urban capacity
Site 59880

Comments relating to sites 59654 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

I do not agree this site should be developed for residential use

The key objections are based on:

- * Development on Green Belt land resulting in urban sprawl without evidence of extraordinary circumstances required to do so.
- * Development within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- * Overdevelopment of an existing community and services, increased traffic and demand on existing services.
- * Insufficient road and transport network to allow further residential

42784417 Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

Comment relating to site 59880 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

At times of heavy rainfall Rectory Lane is frequently subject to flash flooding, both from the top of the lane where water running down the Tonbridge Road sweeps into Rectory Lane and also as a result of the run off of surface water from the fields comprising this site. Consequently the water sweeps into and floods my property, which is opposite the proposed site on an already regular basis. Increasing the amount of impermeable surfaces will only increase the flood risk. This can only get worse during the planning period due to the likely increase in flood events due to climate change. During heavy rainfall the existing drainage system in Rectory Lane cannot cope. The drains overflow, in particular the manhole cover outside Bramleys at the junction with the A25 resulting in the discharge of sewage and other detritus being spread across the surface of the lane. Extremely unpleasant and a serious health concern. Again, any additional housing will exacerbate this.

The size of the proposed development is out of character with the surrounding residential area.

The size of the development will put additional pressure on already over subscribed local services, including GP services, primary school places and local bus services.

Rectory Lane is a quiet, rural, single track lane which can easily become congested and blocked by traffic approaching from both ends. It will be unable to cope with additional traffic arising as a result of the proposed additional housing.

Comments relating to site 59770 noted, including comments relating to flood risk and infrastructure. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42636641

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

I am writing to place objections to your plans for new developments in the Wateringbury area. The developments which are proposed adjacent to Red Hill include not only fertile agricultural land on Greenfield Sites, but also an area well-known as a breeding ground for nesting birds, and in particular the severely endangered Turtle Dove, which is a Red List species, and highly protected. The sites on which the Turtle Dove currently nests, and has done for years, are numbers 59803, 59800, 59802, and 59728 in the TMBC list. Apart from destroying natural habitat for wildlife, which is also counter-productive to the well-being of local people, it would be illegal to disturb the habitat of a Red-Listed species. The number and variety of birds in the area has been dwindling for some years as nesting sites are increasingly threatened by pollution, and the inevitable extra volume of traffic produced by further development would further exacerbate the problem.

Site numbers 59729, 59654, 59664 are also on land which should be left for the enjoyment and peace of local people, whose lives would be turned upside down by the increase in noise and light pollution, as well as the inevitable increase in air pollution which additional housing would bring into the area.

Red Hill is a direct link between the A20 and A26 and is already heavily used by commercial vehicles, with long queues building up at the crossroads in Wateringbury from all directions. I cannot see how Objective 10 'The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to minimise climate change' could possibly be served by this proposal, and indeed the very reverse is quite obvious. Apart from this, the roads were not built for the kind of traffic they are already experiencing, and they would struggle to cope with the demands I object to the proposed developments of sites ID 59720, ID 59608, ID 59871, ID 59793, ID 59709, ID 59872, ID 59770 and the development of Borough Green Garden City site ID 59830. My reasons for objecting are the impact these developments will have on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the loss of Metropolitan Green Belt. There will also be a loss of 'green wedge' between Ightham and Borough Green and both areas will be adversely impacted should the hugely disproportionate development of Borough Green Garden City go ahead. Ightham is a historic village and overdevelopment will have a huge impact on the village. In addition to these concerns the impact on the environment will be huge, with the loss of trees, hedgerows and wildlife. The already struggling outdated drainage system will not be able to cope with the increase of sewage and wastewater and

Comments relating to sites 59729, 59654, 59664 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42798881

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42782817

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

I strongly disagree with the proposed sites 59871 and 59872.

I believe both would have a seriously detrimental impact on both the setting of St Peters Church, and create untenable strain on the limited amenity in the village.

I am concerned about the proposal to build adjacent to the A25: removal of green belt is not acceptable, and building houses next to the road would expose the residents to poor air quality and excessive noise, in addition to causing more congestion onto A25. It's also worth noting that a major sewer run is located in this area, which has wayleaves associated with it. The easement zone around this is understood to be 6 or 10m, which would seriously hamper any construction works on the proposed sites.

42801089	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	Sites 59720 and 59709 would result in a significant number of houses in a site 59707 & 59731.	Comments relating to sites 59871 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
		This is quality agricultural land in a greenbelt and more importantly AONB. To develop on this land would create urban sprawl into the protected Greenland of this borough and damage the countryside. The land is full of wildlife and is a natural habitat which would be decimated. The land forms views over the countryside to the Downs and is an important landscape to preserve. There are many, many other opportunities to develop other areas, sites in the borough rather than take away this important natural zone. A quick look locally reveals the Carillion site on West Street in Wrotham which is available to provide a significant number of houses, flats without damaging the landscape and taking away AONB's.	
42691361	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	To develop on these two sites would be shameful and lack forethought giving the impression of a lazy, ill thought out solution to provide the compliance requirements of the Government for more housing in the Rectory Lane 59770 - Mixed Use tbc - Any vehicles coming and going from this site would make the A25 even more dangerous than it is. This stretch of the A25 comes to a standstill due to the local primary school and accidents are frequent at this pressure point, with vehicles turning into the recreation Without wishing to appear a NIMBY, I'm a little disappointed at the inclusion of the following areas and puzzled by the overlap although I recognise that there are some changes in the source - 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804, 59835. These areas form an arc around North Tonbridge and are important spaces	Comments relating to sites 59707 and 59731 noted, including relating to environmental matters. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42803073	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted		Comments relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42778017	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted		Comments relating to site 59735, 59798, 59801, 59804 and 59835 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42322369	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	59712 - Objection. AONB and Greenbelt.	Comment relating to site 59712 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42322369	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	59720 - Objection	Comment noted.
42824065	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	All the sites identified in Mereworth and West Peckham area are wholly unacceptable as they have a huge detrimental impact on the rural character of the area and would impinge on the green belt both of which must be	Comment noted.

59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608, 59793, 59872, 59830 .

I wish to comment on the Ightham potential sites as proposed on the Local Plan. These proposed sites start at the edge of Borough Green and continue to line the A25 toward Old Lane, Ightham. I believe that development here will have a detrimental affect on the nature of Ightham village, on the traffic along the A25, and harm the area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Currently there is a distinct separation between the villages of Borough Green and Ightham, namely the fields and open space along the A25. Should the above development/s be approved there will ultimately be a continuous urban sprawl stretching from the eastern edge of St. Mary's Platt, through Borough Green linking the village of Ightham to this. I believe this ribbon development will urbanize Ightham, making it indistinguishable with Borough Green and it's village appeal will be lost.

The knock-on effect of traffic on A25 will be substantial. Today the road cannot cope with the levels of traffic at rush hour with the A25 into Seal a huge bottle neck. Ditto from the roundabout at Ightham bypass into Borough Green. Hundreds more houses will clearly put a massive strain on the road. The back lanes to Sevenoaks are already dangerous rat runs for people trying to avoid the resulting queues of traffic. With this increased traffic will be higher levels of noise and air pollution, detrimental to the local residents. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be harmed by the urban creep and I believe the rural, village qualities of Ightham lost.

59830 Borough Green Garden City - this disproportionately sized development will have an overwhelming affect on the whole area from Sevenoaks to Maidstone. It will substantially change the nature of Borough Green. These comments are for sites 59720 (Gracelands), 59709 (Darkhill Farm), and 59830 (Borough Green Garden City), as well as 59871 (also Gracelands). As residents of Ightham Village, we are firm believers in the importance of protecting the green belt, and ensuring no harmful development takes place within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. All of the aforementioned sites are disproportionately large, especially 59830, and would result in the destruction of significant areas of woodland and/or areas sustaining important local wildlife. As such, we would strongly object to their inclusion in any local plans for housing.

The sites would each lead to excessive traffic through the village of Ightham, both during construction and through excessive population increase, for which the village road network is simply not suitable. The pinch point outside the George and Dragon pub is already a problem, and the country lanes around would be overwhelmed.

Our historic village cannot support the overdevelopment that these large sites would cause. Gracelands 59871, whilst smaller, would still lead to increased traffic on Fen Pond Road which is already too busy - and with no respect from drivers for the 30mph speed limit in force, drivers regularly come round the bend at 50mph+ and there have recently been two significant accidents as a result. This is a stretch of road that urgently needs less traffic, rather than more!

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608, 59793, 59872 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59709, 59830 and 59871, including comments relating to traffic and the historic nature of the area noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42832993

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42833217

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

The Marley Site - Site Ref. 59681 - Area : 3.18ha The Marley Site has a relatively small amount of built development and is predominantly open storage. It is an industrial site in the Green Belt. To the east is the Invicta Business Park which is a relatively low level group of commercial units where lots of small businesses ply their trade. Immediately to the east of that are the open fields where Moto applied to build their 200 HGV truck stop services. TMBC comprehensively refused the application and many of the arguments made so eloquently by Officer [redacted] also apply to the Marley Site.

The constraints are predominantly the Green Belt designation and its position in the setting of the AONB. Many of the most successful arguments that were made by Adem Mehmet were based around the long distance views from the Golden Knob Viewing point and the long distance views from nationally designated foot paths along the scarp of the North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

It is imperative that the site remains a commercial one within the Green Belt and the size constraints that go with it. If it were to be removed from the Green Belt then the resulting development would be wholly out of character with all the building line along the southern side of the A20 and be completely discordant in the long distance views from the Downs.

Green Field, west of Marley Tiles - Site Ref. 59680 - Area : 6.48ha This is an agricultural field in one of the most visually stunning areas of countryside around the ancient village of Wrotham. It is in the green belt and immediately adjacent to the AONB. The elevated residential houses within Whitehill, which are within the AONB, look down and across these fields, as does the elevated views from National Footpaths located on the North Downs scarp. There is also PROW footpath MR2345 that passes through the land and its views would be irretrievably damaged by the commercial proposal.

[Site reference 59871/59720/59709/59770/59872/59793/59608]

> Objection to following developments:
 > 59871/59720/59709/59770/59872/59793/59608
 > Good evening,

> I fully object to all the above developments.

> As this is mainly on green belt land and our infrastructure in Ightham and Borough Green will definitely not cope, our roads are over used and our local facilities are not enough to support these developments.

> I would much prefer for land within the towns in Tonbridge and malling to be developed and for the villages and green areas to be not developed on.
 > Many Thanks

Comments relating to site 59681 noted, including in relation to the Green Belt. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59680 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59871, 59720, 59709, 59770, 59872, 59793, 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42376993 42376993 Stansted
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ightham and

42376993 42376993 Stansted
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ightham and

42499265 0 Stansted
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ightham and

Plan number 59608

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build in excess of 37 dwellings on Ismays Road, Ightham.

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

Objective 2.

The site is placed within the Poor Accessibility Band. There are no public transport facilities within easy reach of this site

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43412865

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

Plan number 59770

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build on the site at Rectory Lane, Ightham.

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

Objective 2.

The site is placed within the Fair Accessibility Band as there is access to the A25. However, public transport facilities are limited.

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43412865

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

Plan number 59720 and 59871 Gracelands

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build on the Graceland's Sites 59720 and 59871

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

The proposal is for a total of 230 dwellings. On the assumption there would be on average 4 people per household, this would mean 1000 more patients for the surgery - an increase of approximately 7% which is completely unsustainable.

Comments relating to site 59720 and 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43412865

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

Plan number 59709

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build on the site at Darkhill Farm plan number 59709

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

Objective 2.

The site is placed within the Good Accessibility Band as there is access to the A25. However, public transport facilities are limited.

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43412865

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
Stansted

[Site reference 59761]

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

Comments relating to sites 59761 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.

43416833

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

Plan number 59770

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build on the site at Rectory Lane, Ightham.

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

Objective 2.

The site is placed within the Fair Accessibility Band as there is access to the

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43417889

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
Stansted

Plan number 59608

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build in excess of 37 dwellings on Ismays Road, Ightham.

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

Objective 2.

The site is placed within the Poor Accessibility Band. There are no public [site reference 59770]

As a long-standing resident of Rectory Lane I wish to record my strong objection to the inclusion of this site into the local plan framework for the following reasons:-

* The site is within MGB and as such there is a strong presumption against development unless there are very special circumstances otherwise. There are no special circumstances for development within the MGB here and this site should not be included within the development framework.

* The site falls outside the village envelope and as such there is a presumption against development.

* The road infrastructure in Ightham cannot cope with current traffic demands never mind the increases that will result should this site be developed. The Rectory Lane/ Sevenoaks Way/ A25/ Oldbury Lane is a notorious accident zone. Further development would make worse an already dangerous series of junctions onto an overloaded trunk road.

* Development of this site will diminish the number of open spaces in

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43417889

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

43419201

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

[Site reference 59720 Gracelands Ightham]

As a long-standing resident of Rectory Lane I wish to record my strong objection to the inclusion of this site into the local plan framework for the following reasons:-

* The site is within MGB and as such there is a strong presumption against development unless there are very special circumstances otherwise. There are no special circumstances for development within the MGB here and this site should not be included within the development framework.

* The site falls outside the village envelope and as such there is a presumption against development.

* The road infrastructure in Ightham cannot cope with current traffic demands never mind the increases that will result should this site be developed. The Rectory Lane/ Sevenoaks Way/ A25/ Oldbury Lane is a notorious accident zone. Further development would make worse an already dangerous series of junctions onto an overloaded trunk road.

* Development of this site will diminish the number of open spaces in [Site reference site 59709]

As a long-standing resident of Rectory Lane I wish to record my strong objection to the inclusion of this site into the local plan framework for the following reasons:-

* The site is within MGB and as such there is a strong presumption against development unless there are very special circumstances otherwise. There are no special circumstances for development within the MGB here and this site should not be included within the development framework.

* The site falls outside the village envelope and as such there is a presumption against development.

* The road infrastructure in Ightham cannot cope with current traffic demands never mind the increases that will result should this site be developed. The Rectory Lane/ Sevenoaks Way/ A25/ Oldbury Lane is a notorious accident zone. Further development would make worse an already dangerous series of junctions onto an overloaded trunk road.

* Development of this site will diminish the number of open spaces in Ightham encouraging and extending urban sprawl contrary to good planning practice.

Comments relating to site 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43419201

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

43419201

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

[Site reference site 59830]

As a long-standing resident of Rectory Lane I wish to record my strong objection to the inclusion of this site into the local plan framework for the following reasons:-

* The site is within MGB and as such there is a strong presumption against development unless there are very special circumstances otherwise. There are no special circumstances for development within the MGB here and this site should not be included within the development framework.

* The site falls outside both Ightham and Borough Green village envelopes and as such there is a presumption against development.

* The road infrastructure in Borough Green and Ightham cannot cope with current traffic demands never mind the increases that will result should this site be developed. And additional 3,500 homes and accompanying uses will put intolerable strain on an already overloaded A25 and A227. The Rectory Lane/ Sevenoaks Way/ A25/ Oldbury Lane is a notorious accident zone.

Further development would make considerably worse an already dangerous series of junctions onto an overloaded trunk road.

* Development of this site will diminish the open space between Borough Green and Ightham encouraging and extending urban sprawl contrary to good [Site reference 59608]

Comment relating to site 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43419201

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

As a long-standing resident of Rectory Lane I wish to record my strong objection to the inclusion of this site into the local plan framework for the following reasons:-

* The site is within MGB and as such there is a strong presumption against development unless there are very special circumstances otherwise. There are no special circumstances for development within the MGB here and this site should not be included within the development framework.

* The site falls outside the village envelope and as such there is a presumption against development.

* The road infrastructure in Ightham cannot cope with current traffic demands never mind the increases that will result should this site be developed. The A227 is a notorious accident zone within Ightham. Further development would make worse an already dangerous series of junctions onto an overloaded trunk road.

* Development of this site will diminish the number of open spaces in

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

43419201

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

[Site references 59608, 59709, 59770, 59830]

As a resident of Ightham I am writing in connection with the requirement from Government to plan for 15, 9341 new homes within the boundaries of Tonbridge and Malling. I would like to point out that Ightham and Ivy Hatch sit within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of the green belt is to protect the countryside and prevent urban sprawl. Many of the proposed developments would see a loss of the green belt and I believe the green belt should be protected, as should the identity of our villages which would be hugely impacted by the overdevelopment of our historic village.

I would like to object to the proposed Ismays Road 59608 plan for 37 dwellings. I live in Ismays Road and am constantly amazed at the amount of traffic going up and down our narrow country road, which unfortunately does not have a speed limit, so in general traffic is moving far too fast. The addition of 37 new dwellings in the road would make this unsustainable.

I would like to object to the proposed Darkhill Farm 59709 plan for Mixed Use tbc. This development would cause the loss of the present "green wedge" between Ightham and Borough Green, and cause increased traffic movements through the village of Ightham, on the A227, the A25 and various country lanes.

43419521	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted	I would like to object to the proposed Rectory Lane 59770 plan for Mixed use tbc. Rectory Lane is already very narrow and the addition of "mixed use" traffic through the narrow confines of this road would be chaotic. Please note and register that I am vehemently opposed to any development on the following sites: Dark Hill Farm 59709 Green belt AONB land [59871]	Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59793, 59872 and 59608 noted, including comments relating to the Green Belt and AONB. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
43419969	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted	planning application at Gracelands 59871. I oppose this application on the grounds that it falls within an aonb and green belt. it would be an absolute travesty for any new development in this pretty village of Ightham. [59705]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
43483137	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted		Comment relating to site 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
43485985	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted 25240577	Our client controls land south of Invicta Business Park, Wrotham (Site 59705), which we believe represent suitable locations for employment	Comment relating to site 59705 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

This is of exceptional and significant importance to our wider community and that it is in the Kent North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The land supports 'Kent in the Garden of England' and in the Metropolitan Greenbelt. It is a 'Green wedge' with historic Ightham.

Regarding improving highways infrastructure ahead of any consideration of thousands of houses in our community, both Kent County Council and Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council have been big operational and financial supporters of the plan to re-instate the east facing slips in the vicinity of M25 J5 Sevenoaks. These slip roads will provide connectivity of the M26 and A21 to deliver a long overdue West Kent Bypass and effectively remove any local needs of relief roads to individual parishes within our community. That removes any case of special or exceptional circumstance for local relief roads for taking land out of the green belt - AONB for mass housing building programmes in West Kent.

Aligned to current and future traffic levels through this mass housing estate proposal, we are challenged by air pollution and poor air quality. The pollution levels in Borough Green in 2014 were high enough that an Air Quality Management Area was declared, which should limit development. The new development and its traffic will increase pollution levels and increase public health. It is recognised that the A25 from Wrotham Heath to Riverhead is now virtually one gigantic AQMA and this proposed development will only make matters worse rather than everyone looking to improve our air quality and mitigate air pollution in the danger zones of the A25. Air Quality monitoring for NO2, PM0.1 / 2.5 and 10.0 continues.

[Site 59643]
 * Site 59643 – Hoath Wood ancient woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal/residential dwellings adjoining Lavendar Road: This will bring harm to the conservation areas. Ancient woodland and tree preservations orders, countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of the existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic restricted on local roads, visual impairment from AONB.

[Site 59665]
 * Site 59655 – Road to North Pole behind Victory Drive: Green belt areas, countryside, harm to quiet lanes and rural road networks, is outside of the

Comments relating to site 59709 noted, including comments relating to the Green Belt, traffic and air quality and transport. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59643 and 59665 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42362561 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

44236769 Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

Wrotham

In brief summary, the land adjacent to Kemsing Road and Borough Green Road, Wrotham is situated in a sustainable location with no physical constraints, is available for development and at the time of writing contractual arrangements are being put in place by Mr Feakins and Redrow Homes.

The intention is to come forward with an application for a proposed residential scheme in the next six months. It is therefore put forward that the land should be allocated for residential development as part of the call for sites and local plan preparation process.

2

The site is located to the south of Kemsing Road and the west of Borough Green Road. It extends to approximately 4 hectares and is located immediately adjacent to the built confines of Wrotham. Given the size of the site, existing adjacent development patterns and rural housing density indicators it is considered that the site could accommodate between 100 to 130 dwellings.

Figure 1 – Plan showing context of site at Wrotham and compared to built up area.

There are two potential accesses at the site with initial feasibility studies suggesting that both are technically suitable in terms of visibility, sight lines and width. Furthermore, subject to the necessary design process and agreements, pedestrian links can be provided from the site into Wrotham centre.

3

Wrotham is a well serviced village with a wide range of amenities. It has a church, village hall, three pubs, village shop, doctors, hairdressers, mobile

Comments relating to sites 59707 noted, including relating to the infrastructure within Wrotham. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and

44274145 44274017 Stansted

Wrotham

Sustainable development

The golden thread at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and this runs throughout the Framework.

Paragraph 7 of the Framework states that “the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.

Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that there are three overarching objectives to sustainable development, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. These are an economic objective, a social objective, and an environmental objective.

Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states “Planning policies and decisions should pay an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions”.

Paragraph 10 of the Framework states “So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.” Further, the Housing Delivery Test 2021 released in January 2022 identifies that at a 63% housing delivery position, presumption in favour should be applied in Tonbridge and Malling’s jurisdiction.

4

Paragraph 11 specifically refers to how Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development, with 11 a) stating “For plan-making this means that: all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area;

Site specific comments relating to site 59707 noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and

44274145 44274017 Stansted

Wrotham

Green Belt, Paragraph 140 of the Framework sets out that Green Belt Boundaries can be altered through the preparation or updating of Local Plans. Paragraph 142 goes on to state that “When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account...Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport.”

It is contended that the land at Kemsing Road and Borough Green Road would offer the opportunity to provide a sustainable, accessible housing development through the release of Green Belt land in an infill capacity. The release of the land from the Green Belt could be offset by compensatory improvements to environmental quality and would not result in encroachment into the countryside, given the residential nature of the adjacent sites.

When considering the suitability of the site in respect of the landscape designation of the Kent Downs AONB, it is put forward that the land at Kemsing Road and Borough Green Road is a more favourable site for allocation to meet the Council’s housing requirement than other sites in the locality, specifically sites 339 (St Mary’s Road, Wrotham) and 198 (Land at Howland Allotments, Wrotham). Site 339 was not allocated by the Council as part of the previous Call for Sites process, as it was considered to be undeliverable due to its lack of access; it was however considered to be sustainable. Site 198 was previously allocated as a building block but this site is situated at a high level in a prominent location within close proximity to the M20. In the site summary report, the Council considered that this could

Comments relating to sites 59707 noted, including relating to the Green Belt. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and

44274145 44274017 Stansted

1.1.1 This representation is prepared on behalf of Mr K Haward in response to the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council 'TMBC' Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation which closes 3rd November 2022. 1.1.2 We understand that Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan to set out a strategy for development for the period to 2040 and that the Council is asking for views on principles that should determine where these homes should be built, and how it can deliver infrastructure improvements across Tonbridge and Malling. 1.1.3 Our client owns Dark Hill Farm, Borough Green Road, Ightham (Site 59720), which we believe represents a suitable and sustainable future housing location and as endorsed by a number of previous planning consents granted by the borough Council. Given the acute housing need, our client is now promoting the site for residential allocation with capacity for approximately 75 units deliverable within the emerging Plan period. This is deemed to be the most prudent use of the land given the sustainability credentials and previously permitted development types. As part of any allocation, the site has the potential to offer substantial public benefits including gifting of 5 acres of currently private woodland to the local community, increased permeability and the improvement of the local footpath network. 1.1.4 As part of this promotion, we provide a detailed response to the questions being posed by the Council before outlining further how we consider our client's site fits within the spatial options being considered. [Answers to questionnaire entered in that section]

1.3.1 Our client's land comprises a circa 8.26 Ha area of partly residential use at Dark Hill Farm, Ightham. It is situated between three main roads: the A25 Ightham By-Pass to the north, Borough Green Road to the south and Fen Pond Road to the west and thus is accessible from multiple locations with

Comments relating to site 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

44403137 25240577 Stansted
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ightham and

		<p>-----</p> <p>1.0 INTRODUCTION 1.1 These representations are submitted on behalf of CP Logistics UK Sevenoaks Propco Ltd (part of Panattoni) in response to Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council's Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation Document (DLP) published in February 2021. 1.2 Panattoni own land at Marley Tiles, London Road, Wrotham (hereafter referred to as the 'Site') (Appendix A). As such it has a direct interest in the Local Plan and the long-term development strategy for Tonbridge & Malling.</p> <p>1.3 Within the adopted Development Land Allocations Development Polies Plan (2008) Local Plan, the Site is an allocated employment site within the Green Belt, comprising Nepicar Area West Major Developed Site (M1 (n)) and benefits from extant use for the manufacture, storage and distribution of tiles (B2/B8 Use Class). Therefore, the principle of employment development at the Site is well established within TMBC's adopted Local Plan. 1.4 Panattoni is currently preparing a Full planning application to TMBC for redevelopment of the Marley Tiles site, comprising a single Class B8 (storage and distribution) building (comprising 5,418 sq. m total floorspace) with associated access, servicing, parking and landscaping. The development proposals have been tailored to a specific occupier, parcel delivery firm DPD. This planning application will be submitted imminently. 1.5 The development proposals will deliver a wide range of key social, environmental and economic benefits, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of intensification in the use of brownfield land aligned and supported by National and local planning policy objectives • Creation of significant inward investment in modern, high quality commercial accommodation which promotes the use of renewable technologies. • Delivery of significant economic benefits including employment opportunities during the construction and operational phases of [Site reference 59608] <p>Site Plan No. 59608 - Ismays Road</p> <p>The above site situated in Ismays Road should be removed from the local plan as it does not meet the positive objectives needed for future housing development for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Situated in Green Belt and AONB</p> <p>Situated on a narrow quiet country lane away from any amenities, schools, doctor's surgeries, shops and railway station.</p> <p>Would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions as all properties would need 2 cars to access work, school and amenities.</p> <p>Infrastructure:- Mains Drains unable to cope with extra housing as they frequently become blocked for a variety of reasons, collapse, tree roots etc. causing the effluent to pour down my garden.</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59681 noted including comments relating to new employment provision. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
<p>44460673</p>	<p>Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted</p>	<p>Electricity:- Overhead power lines in this area causing power cuts with cables being brought down during high winds.</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to OBJECT most strongly to the proposal to build in excess of 37 dwellings on Ismays Road, Ightham.

I am a resident.

My objections to the proposals are as follows:

Objective 1 mentions that it is within 800m of an existing healthcare facility.

There is only one medical centre in the area - Borough Green Medical Practice. This surgery serves not only Ightham, but Borough Green, Wrotham and many of the outer villages such as Stansted and Fairseat. The practice already has in excess of 15,000 patients and last year there were over 96,000 appointments on top of flu jab clinics and Covid injection clinics.

It is already stretched to the limit and cannot sustain any more growth in the area.

Objective 2.

The site is placed within the Poor Accessibility Band. There are no public transport facilities within easy reach of this site

Objective 3
[Site 59871]

planning application at Gracelands59871 . I oppose this application on the grounds that it falls within an aonb and green belt. it would be an absolute travesty for any new development in this pretty village of ightham.

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42687745

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

43483137

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
0 Stansted

[59608]

I live in Ivy Hatch and I want to register my deep concern about the suggestion that 37 houses be built on Ismays Road. This is a narrow country lane in an AONB and is therefore entirely inappropriate for this scale of development. It would change the character of the area for the worse, destroy habitats and cause huge disruption while it was being built.

We have hardly any public transport here and the last thing we need is more cars heading down country roads with horses and children walking along them.

Secondly here are my responses to the local plan. It was really lengthy and really really difficult to understand for the layperson so I am using the response written by another community member. I agree with everything he has said though - apart from where he says more cycle lanes are a bad idea. I disagree with this. Cycling safely should be a priority and parking less so.

In short the development proposed for Borough Green on green belt land is an abhorrence. This is a village not an urban centre. It should not go ahead here but use brownfield sites in Tonbridge where there is already the infrastructure to support more people. Green belt needs to be defended. We

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

We want to object to the potential building proposal of 37 dwellings on Ismays Road – Ref 59608. The site is agricultural not brownfield, has poor accessibility and is not within walking distance of a school.

Our horse livery yard is on the opposite side of the track of the proposed development and we share the access by a formal right of way. The track is also a public footpath that runs down to the Tonbridge Road. Our water supply is underneath the track and we have the right to dig it up at any time for repairs. No vehicles may be parked in the right of way at any time. We are one of few businesses in Ivy Hatch, albeit small.

The main points we would like to highlight are:

* Our 10 horse yard would likely become unsustainable from a safety and security point of view if the proposal went ahead resulting in reduced local recreational amenities. Horses are unpredictable and easily frightened. During the development building materials could be hazardous, particularly in windy weather, making it dangerous for the children and adults to ride their horses in the arena and up the track. The yard is currently very concealed with access being via the track, but the development would open it up from a security point of view and there have been numerous thefts from yards in close proximity, particularly recently.

* It would be a harmful development in an area of outstanding natural beauty as we are in the epicentre of many bridleways which are becoming increasingly inaccessible due to the number of cars on the roads and the speed at which they travel. In many places along Ismays Road it is not wide

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

44719265

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

42705313

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

As a resident of Ivy Hatch for 54 years I am deeply saddened and incredibly disturbed to see the additional number of sites that have been put forward for you to consider in Ightham, Ivy Hatch as well as the larger Borough Green Gardens Site so many of us wrote and objected to back in November 2018. The historic villages of Ightham and Ivy Hatch sit within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The sole purpose of the Metropolitan Green Belt is to protect the countryside and prevent urban sprawl. The Green Belt should be protected as should the individual identity of our villages and I will fight as hard as I can to maintain this. Any new developments will seriously impact on our villages and village life. The serious congestion on the A25 in both directions Monday to Friday already leads to a vast number of road users using the country lanes to bypass the lengthy queues. The volume of traffic on our country lanes is already at a seriously unacceptable and dangerous level and I can't begin to consider how disastrous any volume of extra traffic would be for our local villages and the environment.

What will it take to make our country lanes safer? Will it take the death of a pedestrian, cyclist, or horse rider before anyone listens to us! We have no pavements, no speed limits, in fact there is nothing in place to slow the traffic and trust me, they do drive at speed and dangerously.

Another major concern I have is the lack of utilities especially water and waste. This summer our taps in Ivy Hatch and surrounding areas ran dry due to the inadequacy of our waterboard and not having the infrastructure already in place to cope with current supply and demand. It is 2022, we live in England and our taps ran dry!

Comments relating to sites 59608, 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59872, and 59794 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

44913697

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

increase in sites being proposed within the Local Plan for Tonbridge & Malling.

I wish to register my family's surprise and annoyance that this is being put back on the table after being roundly dismissed previously. Not only is it being put back on the table but further sites have been added that even further affect the beautiful Green belt and AONB within which we live. Whilst I find the scale of the entire plan to be shocking, and my points applicable to nearly all sites, the sites I would like to register a personal rejection of for either employment or residential use are:

59680

59593

59707*

59731* (which seems to cover the same area at 59707)

59881*

59751

59711

59712

59880*

59611

59681

59705

59643

59665

59706

59709*

59720*

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

44977473

Comments relating to sites 59680, 59593, 59707, 59731, 59881, 59751, 59711, 59712, 59880, 59611, 59681, 59705, 59643, 59665, 59706, 59709 and 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42798401	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>Unfortunately, I just spent over 45 mins filling out the online questionnaire and it crashed before finishing. I unfortunately do not have time to start again so I would like to register my opinion via e-mail instead.</p> <p>I would like to register my opposition to the proposed developments in the Greenbelt and AONB in Wrotham. I strongly believe that Greenbelt areas and AONB should remain protected from urban sprawl. These sites should only be developed in extreme cases only and I do not believe there is anything to support an extreme case and development of the sites put forward in and around Wrotham.</p> <p>Once the president is set for these sites to be developed then there is no point in allocating areas with protection when it can be so easily disregarded. My understanding is that an AONB is allocated to protect, conserve and enhance natural beauty. Some of the proposed development sites are within both Greenbelt and AONB. It is beyond my comprehension why these sites are even proposed for development and the disregard for the protection acts in place on them. To add, the number of houses and packed development is also completely out of character for the area and would certainly ruin what the status of Greenbelt and AONB are in place to protect. I do not oppose Borough Green Garden City in the case of development of the old quarry as brown belt land. I understand there are housing needs to be met and I am not an idealist. I absolutely think sites such as the quarry should be allocated as priority for development over Greenbelt/AONB sites. That said, increased traffic and infrastructure is still a huge concern for the area if the quarry is developed. I do think proper infrastructure needs to be implemented to ease road congestion and transport issues need to be addressed if development does happen through the quarry site.</p> <p>So to conclude, the sites I oppose for development are all those that sit [59608, 59793, 59872, 59720, 59709, 59770]</p>	Comments relating to sites 59880, 59881, 5970, 59731, 59712, 59751, 59788 and 59711 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45010689	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Any development should be on brownfield sites * The necessary support infrastructure (roads, schools, medical facilities, playgrounds, electrical, gas, water and sewage)must be in place BEFORE planning is approved. * Only affordable housing should be built * On large developments all the necessary road and transportation infrastructure must be suitable for proposed site density * For sustainability local materials should be used. * Alternative energy products must be used to reduce carbon footprint, 	Noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

[59608]

I'd like to register my objection to the allocation of ANY new houses on the proposed Ismays Road site at the nursery as part of the local plan.

Please find the details of why this development is entirely inappropriate below.

I would also like to add that I believe planning permission was only granted for the existing house on the grounds of the nursery built by Tom the owner, on the basis that it was necessary to have accommodation there for the business to be viable.

44719265	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	Should houses be built the business would not be a going concern.	Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45095841	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	It seems like a "creep creep" approach to building in an AONB, with pound OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:	Comments relating to site 59712 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45095841	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	[59720] Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham We have recently moved to the area, attracted by the beautiful countryside and the prospect of bringing up our children in peaceful surroundings with cleaner air. We have chosen a less urban area to live so you can imagine we are horrified to hear about the various site proposals in this Local Plan that could be on our doorstep. Ightham is such a quiet and historic village that cannot be let to go to ruin because of developments such as this. I don't have to tell you that development in this area will be damaging a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a risk to the Metropolitan Green Belt. I agree with what was set out in the NPPF (July 2021). Para 137:The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Para 176:Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONB which has the highest status of protection in relation to planning issues. These protections MUST be applied in this Local Plan. I appreciate the need for extra housing and a few small developments that	Comments relating to sites 59720 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45097473	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted		Comment noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

I am a longterm resident of Ivy Hatch, and want to send my opinion and misgivings about proposed developments, for the deadline of 03/11/2022.

The volume of information sent out for this second attempt is ridiculous, many citizens simply will not have had the time to wade through it all.

The notification system will not have reached many people, and the insistence on having internet replies must be excluding some people also; the learning Handicapped, many elderly people, and many young people who may be expecting to spend their lives living in this area in the future.

Particularly for the Darkhill Farm # 59709; Bypass # 59872; Rectory Lane # 59770; Ismays # 59608

and the two Gracelands areas, #s 59720 & 59871

Any and all of the proposals will change and erode the nature of our local environment.

This is an AONB and within the Green Belt, so should accordingly be protected. There are other areas with your Borough area which are not so protected.

45100865
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

Your description of Borough Green is inaccurate - it is a Rural Settlement, with Rural local retail services, not to be classified as something larger and provided with more retail services. Recently, we have LOST retail services
The proposed developments would hugely impact our villages & create massive & harmful overdevelopment in an area of ANOB & mean a great loss of the MGB. The increase in traffic through the village of Ightham on the A227, the A25 & country lanes, would be unbearable & most detrimental to our historic village which already sees massive trucks travelling through on unsuitable narrow roads.

*Gracelands 59720

An ANOB & MGB

The high density of 198 dwellings is completely unacceptable.

A huge increase in vehicles on the already very busy Borough Green Road & narrow Fen Pond Road.

*Gracelands 59871

An ANOB & MGB

Traffic exiting on to a narrow & dangerous bend on the Fen Pond Road.

*Dark Hill Farm 59709

An ANOB & MGB

This proposal would mean the loss of the important wedge between Ightham & Borough Green, both villages losing their identities & yet again, a heavy increase of traffic on all our roads & lanes.

*Borough Green Road 59793

The proposed dwellings here would be in very close proximity to

Comments relating to sites 59709, 59872, 59770, 59608, 59720 and 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45175841
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709 and 59793 and transport issues noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

[Sites 59720, 59709, 59608]

59720 Gracelands,

* OBJECT

* Site is on MGB and in an AONB. The village of Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of MGB is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl.

* Development will mean loss of green wedge between Borough Green and Ightham impacting the individual identity of our villages.

* Proposed development will result in overdevelopment on Ightham historic village.

59709 Darkhill Farm

* OBJECT

* Site is on MGB and in an AONB. The village of Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of MGB is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl.

* Development will mean loss of green wedge between Borough Green and Ightham impacting the individual identity of our villages.

* Proposed development will result in overdevelopment on Ightham historic village.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59709 and 59608 noted, including comments relating to the Green Belt, AONB and infrastructure. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

25405985

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

consultation. This representation objects to the proposed allocation of Land to east of Ismays Road, Ivy Hatch (Site 59608) for residential development. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)[1] (#_ftn1) [1] provides the overarching framework used for preparing Local Plans based on the Government's aims for the planning system, the purpose of which is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It sets out in paragraph 8 that sustainable development has three interdependent objectives that need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways:

- * an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- * a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- * an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The council is required to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated planning practice guidance.

45219585

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

45220737

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

specific interest to the identified potential sites for development referenced 59707/59731, 59751, 59880 and 59881. Oh how I reviewed the Local Plan ('LP') with dismay. I say reviewed because at well over 200 pages, including enclosures, it is far too long and complex to read in depth and gain a thorough understanding and appreciation of the entire content with the limited amount of time available. My initial comment revolves around the almost apparent disregard for the terms Green Belt ('GB') and Area of Natural Beauty ('AONB') in the creation of potential sites for development in the LP. All four sites that I maintain an interest in are all covered by both GB and ANOB and consequently it defies belief that such areas can even be considered for potential development. Two of the reasons for my wife and I moving to Wrotham in the first instance was because the village fell within the GB and was a designated AONB.

Secondly, is the massive overemphasis on 'housing'. While I appreciate National Government is driving a huge requirement for homes to be built in the South-East and this needs to be reflected in the LP, it does so with little regard to the infrastructure requirements needed to support such a level of housing development. The LP acknowledges that infrastructure improvements will be required but almost as an afterthought to the completion of housing development. In Wrotham alone there are two schools next door to each other. At certain times of the day, the existing roads and key junctions in the area are unable to cope with the volume of traffic that each school generates. Significant increase in housing development will only exacerbate the pressure on the existing road networks with no specific plan as to how improvements will be brought about.

It is widely recognised that the local schools in the area cannot support the

Comments relating to sites 59707, 59731, 59751, 59880 and 59881, the role of the Green Belt and infrastructure noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

planned in a way to protect the safety of residents.

Ightham village is narrow, the roads leading into and out of the village already too busy, with traffic moving beyond safe limits.

Further development should not be made near the centre of the village, causing congestion and unsafe conditions. Closeness to the village is not acceptable.

There are no pavements in places and these presumably cannot be installed. No lighting adds further dangers to pedestrians, school children, dog walkers and parents with prams.

To hugely increase housing will create more cars, as many as 3 per household, and add to the current danger. To date nothing has been done to prevent the fast traffic that drives along, (for example) Fen Pond Road. It is used as a cut through, the road twists and has many blind bends. It cannot take more uncontrolled traffic.

Housing should be planned away from villages and built in open areas. There must be other sites, not just the ones proposed.

Housing should be aimed at smaller, affordable dwellings, not more large, expensive properties as has been the trend over the past 30 years. Give people and youngsters the chance to live in the area, not just the wealthy.

Facilities need to be greatly increased for the numbers of new dwelling

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

45221441

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

I would like to make some comments about the following sites in your proposed local plan:

ISMAYS Road, site no - 59608 -37 dwellings

Ightham Bypass, site no - 59872 - 3 dwellings

Rectory Lane, site no - 59770 -mixed use tbc

As a resident of Ightham, I feel the above proposed plans would have a huge impact on us and our surroundings.

There would be a loss of the Metropolitan Green Belt

It would be a harmful development in an AREA of OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY

There would be increased traffic through the village of Ightham on the A227, A25 and the country lanes, which have so much more traffic already than 30 years ago when I grew up here.

There would be an impact of overdevelopment on our historic village

There would be a loss of the 'green wedge' between Ightham and Borough Green

[59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59707, 59872, 59770, 59794]

I wish to formally register my opposition of local plan regulation 18.

I am a resident of Ightham and strongly oppose the plans under consultation for the development of large volumes of housing in and around our beautiful historic village. The local residents are incredibly proud and respectful of the history of the village and yet these crass plans are being made with no regard for the preservation of the wonderful area.

My main concerns over the impact on the village are:

- the loss of our metropolitan green belt: specifically classified to protect the area from development and preserve the stunning countryside
- the serious development of thousands of houses in the Kent downs area of natural beauty. Again, the status of the area has been classified to mark the natural beauty of the area; this will absolutely be devastated if the plans go ahead
- untenable strain on the infrastructure of the area, both in terms of the increased traffic on already very busy roads (a227 and a25) and on the local services

- a loss of the green spaces around the village that are currently enjoyed by the villagers and by visitors to the area

- the impact on the small villages of Ightham and borough green will be hugely disproportionate. The villages will be completely drowned by the new dwellings proposed and the area would be unrecognizable

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 and 59748 noted. Comments relating to these sites and the Green Belt, AONB, facilities, transport and the scale of development noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59707, 59872, 59770 and 59794 noted, including comments relating to the Green Belt and infrastructure. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45222625

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

45222753

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42819617	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>.....</p> <p>1.1 These representations have been prepared on behalf of Croudace Homes in relation to the Land off Crouch Lane, Borough Green. A site location plan of our client's holding is attached at Appendix A1.</p> <p>1.2 Croudace Homes are an established and well-respected house builder. They produce high quality homes to suit all budgets and set high standards for the design and quality of their developments while ensuring they fit into their local environment and respect the local character. Croudace are an active developer within this housing market area and are already delivering homes in Tonbridge and Malling at Hermitage Lane (on the boundary between Maidstone and TMBC). They are currently developing a scheme which was granted permission in 2015 and are bringing forward a subsequent outline consent granted at the beginning of 2022.</p> <p>1.3 Croudace aims to deliver this site into an attractive residential development, providing much needed high quality housing with accompanying green space and enhancements to existing landscaping. The key benefits of the scheme are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of 41 much needed family homes including policy compliant provision of affordable homes. • An attractive development with significant green space and hard and soft landscaping ensuring the right balance between movement and place making. • Generous planting and woodland to create a robust Green Belt Boundary which also mitigates for settlement coalescence. • Highway improvement works along Crouch Lane. • A number of ecological enhancements, including wildflower meadow, new landscaping, and the retention of the vast majority of the existing vegetation <p>As a resident of Ightham village I would like to oppose strongly to site plan 59720 & 59871.</p> <p>Ightham is an historic traditional village surrounded by green belt, nature and beautiful farmland. Developments as planned in these 2 sites would change forever the whole dynamic of this village for the worse with loss of open green fields and a huge impact on the services and traffic in this quiet peaceful village.</p> <p>I believe the sheer number of houses proposed is ludicrously high and unrealistic and will in an instant double the number of homes in the heart of the village.</p> <p>Also site 59709 means all the open fields and land between ightham and Borough Green would be swallowed up in an urban sprawl. The whole area particularly taking into consideration site 59830 would change from individual historic towns and villages surrounded by beautiful open countryside to one huge urban sprawl. Surely residents have the right to protect these individual towns and villages and their surrounding green belts and areas of natural beauty. It is not fair to have these bulldozed away.</p> <p>In summing up I object to sites [59709]</p>	Comments relating to site 59843 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42718337	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted</p> <p>In summing up I object to sites [59709]</p>	Comments relating to sites 59720 and 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45366273	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	I also believe that Darkhill Farm 59709 are Green Wedges preventing our	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45366497	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	[59709] I also object to Site 59709. Greenbelt and more importantly provides separation between our villages, preventing urban sprawl [59709] I found the volume of documents completely baffling and unnecessarily complicated	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45366849	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	I object to this proposal, it is greenbelt land and has been dug up and ruined for years and now we want our land back again. [59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45367329	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709. This greenbelt open space maintains the separation between our villages and has a crucial [59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45367489	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709. This greenbelt open space maintains the separation between our villages and has a crucial [59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45367553	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709. This greenbelt open space maintains the separation between our villages and has a crucial OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45379777	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham	Comments relating to sites 59720 and 59712 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

[Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]

Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens

We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded area and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.

45388417
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between our villages and have a crucial amenity value.
[Site reference 59709]

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45388417
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

We also need to prevent development on site 59709, [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between our village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember
[Site reference 59709]

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42543361
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

We also need to prevent development on site 59709, [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between our village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember
[Sites 59830, 59709 and 59748]
Borough Green Gardens Site 59830

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

reassign
to
Watering
bury

45388641
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

I wish to register my objection to this proposal, all our infrastructure is operating at capacity already, and will not cope with anymore.
We do need houses, but not at this cost, and your relief road will not work because 3000 houses will generate more traffic than we have now
I also believe that Darkhill Farm 59709 and Gough Cooper field 59748 are Green Wedges preventing our villages coalescing
[Site reference 59709]

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 and 59748 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45388897
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

We also need to prevent development on site 59709 [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between our village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember
[Site reference 59709]

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45389025
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
0 Stansted

We also need to prevent development on site 59709 [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between our village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45389409	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>[Site reference 59709]</p> <p>I also object to sites 59709 59748 and 59843. These are all green belt and more importantly they provide separation between our villages preventing urban sprawl.</p> <p>[Site reference 59709]</p>	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45389569	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between out village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember [Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]</p> <p>Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens</p> <p>We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded are[a] and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.</p>	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45389857	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages and have a crucial amenity value.</p> <p>[Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]</p> <p>We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>So I OBJECT to Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens</p> <p>We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded are[a] and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45390017	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages and have a crucial amenity value.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45390113	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>[Site reference 59709]</p> <p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between out village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember [Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]</p> <p>Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens</p> <p>We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded are[a] and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.</p>	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45390177	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages and have a crucial amenity value. [Site reference 59709]</p>	Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45390209	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between out village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember [Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]</p> <p>Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens</p> <p>We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded are[a] and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.</p>	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42713377	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages and have a crucial amenity value.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45390753	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>[Site reference 59709]</p> <p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 [59843 and 59748] these green belt open spaces maintain the separation between out village is an have a crucial amenity value. This area is groaning under the overpopulation already anymore and we will grind to a halt. Remember [Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]</p> <p>Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens</p> <p>We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded are[a] and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.</p>	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45391201	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages and have a crucial amenity value.</p> <p>I strongly object to the plans to develop the Borough Green/Ightham area especially</p> <p>Gracelands 59720</p> <p>Gracelands 59871</p> <p>Rectory Lane 59770</p> <p>Ismays Road 59608</p> <p>Ightham Bypass 59872</p> <p>Borough Green Garden City 59830</p> <p>I have many objections, but the main ones are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The local infrastructure is already under enormous strain 2) The local road network, with many narrow lanes, will be unable to cope with the additional traffic 3) It s unacceptable to build such a massive development so close to and around the A25, which is already is already overburdened with traffic passing from the M26 to the M25. 	Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45414305	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>3) It s unacceptable to build such a massive development so close to and around the A25, which is already is already overburdened with traffic passing from the M26 to the M25.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59770, 59608 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45414465	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>Here is my submission to the Consultation: OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham OBJECTION : Existing use essential 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation. OBJECTION : Greenbelt 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing NO OBJECTIONS 59732 - Novello - Historic landfill 59829 - Joco Pit - Greenbelt INFRASTRUCTURE - is already crumbling - it must be upgraded before a single [Site 59709]</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted, including comments relating to infrastructure and mental health issues. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45414561	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>I wish to strongly object to the plan 59709 for the Dark Hill Farm fields.</p> <p>This is key green belt land in an AONB. It must not be developed.</p> <p>Furthermore it is the key green fields that separate Borough Green from Ightham and prevent the villages becoming one sprawl.</p> <p>Furthermore the infrastructure cannot cope. The roads are already gridlocked and the Sevenoaks Road of BG is regularly flooded with sewage as the current capacity cannot cope.</p>	<p>Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42674977	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>I object to the local plan for Wrotham as a) it would totally alter the character of the village and b) I see no consideration for the infrastructure necessary - such as roads, schools, doctors, pubs, shops etc. [SITE REF: 59712]</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
45428961	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG</p>	<p>Comment relating to site 59712 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

45428961	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>[SITE REFS: 59720 AND 59709]</p> <p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:</p> <p>59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham I wish to comment on how the local plan affects Ightham and Borough Green.</p> <p>My Name is [redacted] and I live close to Ightham.</p> <p>I understand that we need to build some new houses in and around Borough Green.</p> <p>At this stage I am not commenting on the number of houses or where they should be.</p> <p>My most serious concern is the effect the development will have on traffic</p> <p>The traffic is already slow, and often at a standstill, especially it through Borough Green.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59720 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
42756833	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	In addition to making everyday life more difficult. the increase in traffic will cause appallingly air quality ,leading to serious medical effects.	Comments relating to development within the area noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45430305	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	* Site 59643 – Hoath Wood ancient woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal/residential dwellings adjoining Lavendar Road: This will bring harm to the conservation areas. Ancient woodland and tree preservations orders, countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of the existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic	Comment relating to site 59643 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45431969	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>I am writing to object to the over-development of our area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * I object to Kings Hill being treated as a town. It is not an urban area. * There will be loss of amenity and recreational use of woodlands. <p>Development of Ancient Woodland will have a deleterious impact on wildlife and wild plants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * I particularly object to site 59740. Broadwater Farm is good quality farmland. There are also heritage assets which will be harmed. The scale of this development is at an unacceptable level. * There is already excessive traffic on the A228 through Kings Hill. <p>Site 59671 at the Wood Yard is on a particularly dangerous section of the road.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59671, 59740 and development within the area noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45440225	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I write to provide comments on the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and in particular, the proposal to build up to 37 residential dwellings in Ivy Hatch on site 59608 (CfS Ref: 322c0e / postcode TN15 0NY).</p> <p>I am pleased to have been consulted at this early stage on how our community should develop and the areas where new housing should be built to tackle the important issue of providing affordable housing at least cost to the local environment, whilst protecting the greenbelt (including the metropolitan greenbelt) and historic environment. It is important that this new housing is built in close proximity to pre-existing infrastructure which is capable of being extended to meet new demand where required, so that it does not compromise the quality and scope of the existing facilities.</p> <p>With these points in mind, I was surprised and disappointed to see that site 59608 which is situated in an area of outstanding natural beauty and accessed off a quiet single-track country lane within a quaint and historic community, is being considered for residential development. The Local Plan foresees that up to 37 residential dwellings could be built on this land. To illustrate the scale of this project in context, if built, the development would comprise more houses than are currently accessible across the entire length of the proposed access road (Ismays Road) which is over a mile long.</p> <p>The relevant site is situated in the metropolitan greenbelt and is within an area of outstanding natural beauty. The precise purpose of the metropolitan</p>	Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

25098209	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>Here is my submission to the Consultation: OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham OBJECTION : Existing use essential 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation. OBJECTION : Greenbelt 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing NO OBJECTIONS 59732 - Novello - Historic landfill 59829 - Joco Pit - Greenbelt INFRASTRUCTURE - is already crumbling - it must be upgraded before a single [SITE REF: 59712]</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted, including comments relating to infrastructure and mental health issues. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45459361	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG [SITE REFS: 59720 AND 59709]</p>	<p>Comment relating to site 59712 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45459361	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and Stansted	<p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham.</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59720 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

The available space of 6000 characters to answer Q8 is insufficient given the number of sites that are to be considered. Please find below my comments for Q8.

Q8. Do you agree with the findings of the individual site assessments in Appendix D of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report? Yes/No Please explain and quote the individual site reference number

Site 59881 - Object

Reasons. Not connected to a settlement, the site is on rising ground and will dominate the surrounding rural area. The location is not sustainable, distant from an established settlement, public transport and local amenities.

The development would damage heritage assets including the protected park and the setting of a number of listed buildings for which an isolated rural or parkland setting is key to their significance.

The development would be a huge hole in the Green Belt with no mitigating circumstances.

The development would significantly contribute to more car traffic on quiet rural lanes before adding to the existing congestion on the A26.

Site 59842 - Object

Reasons. The site is prone to run off flooding and is unsuitable for residential development. If it is developed the run off will flood elsewhere in the village.

The location will add traffic stress to Carpenters Lane and the junction with A26 which are already unable to safely cope with existing traffic. It will add to the congestion on the A26 and further damage the air quality in the centre of the village.

It extends a significant distance north of the settlement into the Green Belt and would be an incongruous intrusion into this rural area, as well as being unsustainably too far from amenities.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770 and 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

38333377

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

following comments on the proposed developments at Ightham and Borough Green on a number of grounds, principally:

* Ightham and Ivy Hatch both lie within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – many of the developments around Borough Green and Ightham will result in the permanent loss of this green belt land and will fundamentally change the character of the villages and the AONB countryside – There is no reason that would justify the abandonment of these protections and designations which have been fought for for several generations.

* The A25 and A227 are already extremely busy and the additional traffic that will be generated by these new developments will put further pressure on local roads and infrastructure with no additional improvements planned (apart from what is essentially an access road to the Borough Green Garden Village site)

* Trains to and from London are very busy in rush hour. Regardless of whether the new residents travel by road or rail to work / school / for social use, all the transport infrastructure will be under significantly more strain from the many thousands of new homes proposed for these sites

* The Borough Green Garden Village (59830) and Gracelands developments (59720 and 59871) in particular are wholly disproportionate to the local area and will be an overdevelopment of a small village (Ightham) which will fundamentally change the character of this historic village and overburden its infrastructure. The sites are also on green belt land which separates the villages of Ightham, Borough Green and Wrotham.

59720 Gracelands: The site is in an AONB and on Green Belt land and the I am a resident of Wrotham village, and I am responding to your letter regarding the local plan and the housing targets that you insist on imposing on the already overcrowded South East.

Personally, I am unsure why there is a need to even consider building on green belt land or put increased pressure on rural road networks, schools and doctor's surgeries, when there are other areas (London is only half an hour away) with copious amounts of derelict urban areas which require regeneration and would be much more suitable for building work to take place.

I understand the need to house the ever increasing population, but soon there will be no green space left and this greatly concerns me.

I have been a conservative voter all my life, but am seriously considering switching my allegiance because of this seemingly insatiable need to line the
 * Site 59643 – Hoath Wood ancient woodland next to Broadwater Farm proposal/residential dwellings adjoining Lavendar Road: This will bring harm to the conservation areas. Ancient woodland and tree preservations orders, countryside, harm to quiet lane and rural road networks, outside of the confines of the existing developments, loss of agricultural land, traffic

Comments relating to the Wrotham noted. Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770 and 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to the role of Wrotham, the Green Belt and road networks noted.

Comment relating to site 59643 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45474465
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

45503137
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

45509121
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

45621729	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>>> Good evening>> I fully object to all the above developments>> As this is mainly on green belt land and our infrastructure in Ightham and Borough Green will definitely not cope, our roads are over used and our local facilities are not enough to support these developments.>> I would much prefer for land within the towns in Tonbridge and malling to be developed and for the villages and green areas to be not developed on.</p> <p>We are astonished at your proposal to build 37 dwellings on this very narrow lane, where there is already a traffic problem since several of the existing homes have no alternative to parking on the road. Pedestrians will also be further endangered as, of course, there are no footpaths.</p> <p>We understand that additional homes are needed in the area, largely to be built in Borough Green itself, but cannot see the necessity to spoil the character of the outlying villages by clogging the country lanes with traffic.</p>	Comments relating to sites 59871, 59720, 59709, 59770, 59872, 59793, 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45621953	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>We would also point out that, in the neighbouring Coach Road, four very ugly modern developments have recently been permitted, close to a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Gracelands (59720) * Gracelands (59871) * Ismays Road (59608) * Rectory Lane (59770) * Darkhill Farm (59709) * Borough Green Road (59793) * Ightham Bypass (59872) <p>Dear Sir, Here is my submission to the Consultation – I object to the proposed developments at Ightham and Borough Green on a number of grounds, principally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ightham and Ivy Hatch both sit within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – many of the developments around Borough Green and Ightham will result in the permanent loss of this green belt land and will fundamentally change the character of the villages and the AONB countryside – I fail to see what point there is in having these protections and designations if they can be disregarded by property developers and the District Council * The A25 and A227 are already extremely busy and the additional traffic that will be generated by these new developments will put further pressure on local roads and infrastructure with no additional improvements planned (apart from what is essentially an access road to the Borough Green Garden Village site) * It is already very difficult / almost impossible to get an appointment at Borough Green Medical Centre and the local schools are all busy, I cannot see how this existing infrastructure could support the additional residents in 	Comments noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45625793	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>* It is already very difficult / almost impossible to get an appointment at Borough Green Medical Centre and the local schools are all busy, I cannot see how this existing infrastructure could support the additional residents in</p>	Comments relating to sites 59830, 59720, 59871, 59608, 59770, 59709, 59793 and 59872 noted. Comments relating to these sites and the Green Belt, AONB, facilities, transport and the scale of development noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

assessment of the potential development of Ightham and Borough Green villages.

As you are aware the village of Ightham falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt area, and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. These decisions had been made long before this Government set to impose new housing targets on TMBC, and neither should not be withdrawn just because there is a need for additional homes. Many residents have moved to this area purely because it is protected by Green Belt and AONB, and are therefore very unhappy that a small protected village community is to be potentially overwhelmed by disproportionate development.

Apart from the fact that any overdevelopment will have far reaching effects on schools, doctors, businesses, and of course, the already overstretched road network in the area, people have lived here because it is a small rural village. Many people like to live in Towns, which are busier with more facilities, and many choose to live a quieter surroundings. Any massive development will destroy the village forever. This will also destroy the Green wedge between Ightham and Borough Green.

I understand that there is a need for more homes, but this must be proportionate for each Parish, and whilst some "in-fill" developments in the village would not affect the overall rural feel of Ightham, the mass housing plan for Gracelands and Dark Hill Farm, ref nos. 59720, 59871, 59709, would effectively join Ightham to Borough Green, destroying Ightham village entirely.

I also object most strongly, to the plan for site no. 59720 Gracelands, having sole access on to Fen Pond Road. This is a quiet country lane (despite being a rat run for huge amounts of rush hour traffic from London, that chooses not to use the gridlocked roads at Nepicar and Wrotham Heath. A development

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871 and 59709 noted, including in relation to the AONB, separation of settlements and road traffic. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45636097

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION

SITES OBJECTED TO: 59680, 59593, 59751, 59711, 59712, 59611, 59681, 59705, 59643, 59665, 59706 AND IN PARTICULAR 59707, 59731, 59881, 59880, 59709, 59720, 59830 (THE "SITES")

Dears Sirs,

I am writing to object to the inclusion of the Sites in the Local Plan for Tonbridge & Malling in and around Ightham, Borough Green and Wrotham for residential and commercial development.

I am a local resident, living in the small historic village of Wrotham with my family.

Summary

My family and I object to the development of the Sites as proposed in the local plan on the grounds of the detrimental effect it would have in terms of: traffic and transport; building on the rural landscape; destruction of the habitats of animals, including those with protected status and of significant importance; and the noise, pollution, flooding, disturbance and very serious traffic implications for existing and new residents and businesses.

Comments relating to sites 59680, 59593, 59751, 59711, 59712, 59611, 59681, 59705, 59643, 59665, 59706, 59707, 59731, 59881, 59880, 59709, 59720 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45651073

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

To build the number of houses and/or other structures being proposed, and at sites so close together, would frankly bring all local infrastructure and services to a complete grinding halt.

There are sites in and around Ightham/Borough Green which are not appropriate for development considering the environment and Green Belt.

The following reasons form the basis of my objections:

Loss of AONB and Green Belt;

Harm to AONB and Green belt;

Overdevelopment around the largely grade 2 listed village of Ightham;

Urban sprawl.

These points if ignored will cause significant harm.

The sites are as follows:

Darkhill Farm 59709

Ismays Road 59608

Ightham Bypass 59872

Gravelands 59720

Gracelands 59871

Rectory Lane 59770

Borough Green Garden City 59830 - though some should be built on this

Comments relating to sites 59709, 59608, 59872, 59720, 59871, 59770 and 59830, including Green Belt, AONB and urban sprawl matters noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42604353

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

45656897	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>Good morning Here is my submission to the Consultation: OBJECTIONS 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, One green belt land is gone, it's gone forever. Please keep Kent the garden of England and do not take away these beautiful areas. Not only would this project disrupt the local community but also the wildlife that reside there. 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both greenbelt areas 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both of these are Greenbelt AONB too 59492 Western Rd carpark - this car park is essential for residents of the local area. I do not have and cannot have a drive way and with little roadside parking, it's the only place to park. 58492 Station Carpark - essential for commuters 59849 Crowhill Green -green space for residents 59877 - Greenbelt TMBC Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877 and 59767 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45657089	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>Dear Sir Here is my submission to the Consultation: OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham OBJECTION : Existing use essential 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation. OBJECTION : Greenbelt 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing NO OBJECTIONS 59732 - Novello - Historic landfill</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted, including in relation to spatial strategy and infrastructure. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

		<p>My wife and I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to your proposal and plans to allow 37 houses to be built in Ismays Road in Ivy Hatch as well as your so-called Borough Green Garden City development of 3,000 houses/buildings.</p> <p>Since we have lived in Ivy Hatch the density of traffic in the whole area has increased exponentially and not with much respect for speed limits or the constrained infrastructure.</p>	
45657185	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>We understand there might be a need for additional housing, but without first ensuring comprehensively expanded and fully completed supporting</p> <p>Dear Sir</p> <p>Here is my submission to the Consultation:</p>	Comments relating to sites 59608 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45709985	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham</p> <p>59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and [SITE REFS: 59871, 59720 AND 59872]</p> <p>Having seen the planning for building proposals in and around ightham, I am writing to strongly object about this.</p> <p>The planning I object is 59871 Gracelands, 59720 Gracelands and 59872 IGHTHAM BYPASS.</p> <p>I strongly disagree to building on a green belt.</p> <p>This will cause unnecessary traffic, eye saws in such a beautiful area to live in and noise.</p> <p>I live in the house that backs up onto 59871 so my beautiful view will now be horrid houses.</p>	Comments relating to site 59712 and 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45718945	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>My garden is built on a hill so we'd have zero privacy. I have lived here since I was about 8 years old and have loved living in a beautiful quiet area. Which you are proposing to ruin, this will cause all kinds of problems for the residents of ightham, and I'm sure I'm not the only one to strongly disagree</p>	Comments relating to sites 59871, 59720 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45743553	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>I would like object to a number of sites in and around Ightham, these are sites:</p> <p>Gravelands 59720 Gracelands 59871 Darkhill Farm 59709 Rectory Lane 59770 Ismays Road 59608 Ightham Bypass 59872</p> <p>I object to for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt Loss of and harm to AONB</p>	<p>Overdevelopment in an historic village</p> <p>Creation of 'urban sprawl' in Ightham and Borough Green Loss of farm land Damage to the countryside Damage to the village of ightham</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45744481	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>These points run counter to the guidelines set out in the NPPF and would be</p> <p>I would like object to a number of sites in and around Ightham, these are sites:</p> <p>Gravelands 59720</p> <p>Gracelands 59871</p> <p>Darkhill Farm 59709</p> <p>Rectory Lane 59770</p> <p>Ismays Road 59608</p> <p>Ightham Bypass 59872</p> <p>I object to for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt</p> <p>Loss of and harm to AONB</p>	<p>Overdevelopment in an historic village</p> <p>Creation of 'urban sprawl' in Ightham and Borough Green Loss of farm land Damage to the countryside Damage to the village of ightham</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

[SITE REFS: 59871, 59709, 59608, 59720, 59770 AND 59872]

I would object to the following sites:

Gracelands 59871, Darkhill Farm 59709, Ismays Road 59608, Gracelands 59720, Rectory Lane 59770, Ightham Bypass 59872

Reasons for objections:

Loss of Green Belt and Loss of and harm to AONB.

Loss of green spaces and farm land.

Significant damage to the countryside.

Overdevelopment in and around historic village of mainly grade 2 listed properties.

Creation of 'urban sprawl' in Ightham and Borough Green.

The sites cannot be justified based on NPPF framework. Development would

Comments relating to sites 59871, 59709, 59608, 59720, 59770 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis, site selection processes, and the spatial strategy.

45745729

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

Proposed Developments:

Gracelands 59720

Gracelands 59871

Darkhill Farm 59709

Rectory Lane 59770

Sevenoaks Road 59794

Ismays Road 59608

Borough Green Garden City 59830

Forward my submission for inclusion in the consultation process:

* Loss of the Metropolitan Green Belt

* All the above proposed developments are either on Green Belt sites or will impact on the open spaces between current settlements. One of the main purposes of Green Belt is to protect the countryside from urban sprawl.

Areas of green space are designed to help contain this spread to protect the unique character of rural communities, while also providing areas for agriculture, forests and habitats for native wildlife which none of the above

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59794 and 59608 noted . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42745953

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

I wish to make a formal objection / protest against the proposed developments outlined in the following plans which I believe are unacceptable and should not be approved.

Plans 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872, 59770, 59830.

I would appreciate it if my formal objections could be noted.

The planned developments are greenfield sites and brings into question many issues. Should developments be required I do not believe they should be on the scale proposed and should be limited to the re development of brownfield sites.

There are 110,000 Brownfield sites in London that still have not been utilised. Surely these sites should be used for development first before using Green Belt.

There are also Brownfield sites locally .

The areas of proposed development include AONB with its added development protections and Greenfields

Developers target these sites to maximize profits - avoiding any costs of potential clean up that may be associated with redevelopment of a site.

The proposals should be rejected outright and the elected bodies and " Please Stop Borough Green Garden City, Protect Greenbelt and AONB, once it has gone, it is gone forever"

TMBC Local Plan Reg 18 Consultation

Here is my submission to the Consultation:

OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:

59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates

Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge

59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham

59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt

59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham

OBJECTION : Existing use essential

59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking

58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking

59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation.

OBJECTION : Greenbelt

59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house

59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59709, 59872 and 59770 and comments relating to the role of brownfield land noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59494, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59829 and 59732 noted including comments relating to infrastructure provision. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45816801

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

45816833

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

Here is my submission to the Consultation:
 OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:
 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge
 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham
 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt
 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham
 OBJECTION : Existing use essential
 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking
 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking
 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation.
 OBJECTION : Greenbelt
 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house
 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing
 NO OBJECTIONS
 59732 - Novello - Historic landfill
 59829 - Joco Pit - Greenbelt
 INFRASTRUCTURE - is already crumbling - it must be upgraded before a single

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted, including comments relating to infrastructure and mental health issues. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45816865
 Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ightham and
 Stansted

have any difficulties accessing the attachment), [added in questionnaire] with specific objections to individual proposed site development below.

OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:

59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge

59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham

59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt

59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham

OBJECTION : Existing use essential

59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking

58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking

59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation.

Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections:

The site has no access apart from Old Lane. Old Lane is single track and is not a maintained road. It also floods regularly. There is a gate to the field at the corner of Rectory Lane and the A25. However, this was illegally installed by a past owner, Mr J Slee, to support his unsuccessful application to build houses.

The field is sited opposite the Ightham Recreation Park with its large car park and children's playground. The car park caters for parents to drop off and collect children who attend Ightham Primary School. If the proposed site Re: Site 59770 Mixed Use. I have the following objections:

The site has no access apart from Old Lane. Old Lane is single track and is not a maintained road. It also floods regularly. There is a gate to the field at the corner of Rectory Lane and the A25. However, this was illegally installed by a past owner, Mr J Slee, to support his unsuccessful application to build houses.

The field is sited opposite the Ightham Recreation Park with its large car park and children's playground. The car park caters for parents to drop off and collect children who attend Ightham Primary School. If the proposed site

Comments relating to coalescence, green belt and accessibility issues for sites 559830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment relating to site 59770 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45821121

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42508833

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

45821153

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

45825601	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>Gracelands 59720</p> <p>198 houses on this site is not practical to the houses that already back on to it.</p> <p>Darkhill Farm 59709</p> <p>Too big and taking away fields</p> <p>Borough Green Road 59793</p> <p>[Sites 59720, 59709, 59608]</p> <p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:</p> <p>My comments on specific sites (appendix B list of sites):</p> <p>59720 Gracelands, Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham</p> <p>* OBJECT * Site is on MGB and AONB * Development will mean loss of green verge between Borough Green and Ightham * Development will impact on overdevelopment in Ightham historic village</p> <p>59709 Darkhill Farm</p> <p>* OBJECT * Site is on MGB and AONB * Development will mean loss of green verge between Borough Green and Ightham * Development will impact on overdevelopment in Ightham historic village</p>	Comments relating to sites 59720, 59709 and 59793 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45825825	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>59608 Ismays road</p> <p>* OBJECT</p> <p>We have lived in Ightham (Fielden Lodge, Tonbridge Road, TN15 9AN) for 62 years and have enjoyed its status as a Conservation Area in the Green Belt and North Downs Area of Natural Beauty.</p> <p>We object to the proposed development of all of the Ightham potential sites:- Gracelands 59720, Gracelands 59871, Dark Hill Farm 59709, Rectory Lane 59770, Ismays Road 59608, Borough Green Road 59793,</p>	Comments relating to sites 59870, 59608 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45862369	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>Ightham Bypass 59872.</p> <p>We fully support the objections raised by the Ightham Parish Council and we want Ightham to remain as a Village without the proposed over-</p>	Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608, 59793, and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45867361	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	[SITE REF: 59709] I also believe that Darkhill Farm 59709 and Gough Cooper field 59748 are Green Wedges preventing our villages coalescing. [SITE REF: 59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45867681	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages [SITE REF: 59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45867937	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out villages [SITE REF: 59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45868321	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out [SITE REF: 59709]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45868449	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between out [SITE REF: 59720]	Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45869121	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	We are residents of Ighthan and after reading TMBC's Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation document we agree with the view of Ighthan Parish Council that the site number 59720 Gracelands development proposal does NOT conserve and protect the local environmental assets of the Metropolitan Green Belt or our Area of Outstanding Beauty. There will be a huge impact on the traffic using the A227, the country lanes [SITE REFS: 59720, 59871, 59770, 59608 AND 59872] I write to object to the wholly disproportionate plan to develop thousands of houses in Borough Green and to develop the wedge between Borough Green and Ighthan. This plan: 1) Drives a coach and horses through the idea of green belt 2) Will be hugely harmful to the beauty and tranquility of the AONB that is this area 3) Will put massive pressure on already over-stretched infrastructure 4) Will create unacceptable additional traffic on the A25, A227 and the country lanes around Ighthan Village In particular, I object to the planned development at the following sites: Gracelands 59720	Comments relating to site 59720 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45869217	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	Gracelands 59871 Rectory Lane 59770 Ismays Road 59608	Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59770, 59608 and 59872 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Having lived in Ightham village for 12 years I would strongly oppose the proposed development plans in particular plans 59720 & 59871.

Ightham is an historic traditional village surrounded by green belt, nature and beautiful farmland. Developments as planned in these 2 sites would change forever the whole dynamic of this village for the worse with loss of open green fields and a huge impact on the services and traffic in this quiet peaceful village. We are in danger of losing the marvellous history of our village if the number of proposed new houses were to be approved. These new houses would instantly double the number of homes in the heart of the village and put a further strain on the already overburdened public services. Borough Green Medical Practice and Lloyds Chemist, the bus services, particularly the school bus services are all currently terribly oversubscribed.

In addition proposed site 59709 means all the open fields and land between Ightham and Borough Green would disappear. The wildlife that currently enjoys this space would be in danger and for all tense and purposes evicted. The whole area particularly taking into consideration site 59830 would change from individual historic towns and villages surrounded by beautiful open countryside to one huge urban sprawl. As residents have the right to protect these individual towns and villages and their surrounding green belts and areas of natural beauty. These villages that we chose to live for exactly those reasons. Approval of these plans will drastically change the landscape of the village voted the No.1 village in the UK to live in.

In summary, my objections:

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45875073

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

1.1.1 This representation is prepared on behalf of [redacted] in response to the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council (TMBC) Local Plan (Regulation 18) consultation which runs until 3rd November 2022.

1.1.2 We understand from the document that TMBC is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan to set out a strategy for development for the period to 2040, and that the Council is asking for views on principles that should determine where development should be directed and how it can deliver infrastructure improvements across Tonbridge and Malling.

1.1.3 Our client controls land south of London Road, Wrotham (Site 59680) which we believe represents a suitable, sustainable and logical future location for employment led mixed use development as a natural extension to the existing commercial area.

1.1.4 Notwithstanding our client's interest, we recognise that the consultation document is of a focussed nature. Accordingly, for the purpose of this consultation we simply provide a detailed response to the questions posed by the Council within the consultation document and how our site fits within the spatial options being considered.

1.3 Conclusion

1.3.1 For the reasons set out in this Statement the site is considered suitable for a proportionate scale commercial led development. The site is adjacent to the established employment hub of Wrotham and would form a natural and logical expansion.

1.3.2 Commercial development would make a contribution to the economic needs of the borough, which is tantamount to the exceptional circumstances needed to justify the proposal site being developed within the Metropolitan

OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:

59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge

59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham

59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt

59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham

OBJECTION : Existing use essential

59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking

58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking

59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation.

OBJECTION : Greenbelt

59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house

59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing

Comments relating to site 59680 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to coalescence, green belt and accessibility issues for sites 559830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45875041 25240577 Stansted
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and

39128129 0 Stansted
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and

45861921	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham OBJECTION : Existing use essential 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation. OBJECTION : Greenbelt 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing OBJECTION : Accessibility/ other 59732 - Novello - access road via Fairfield Road is narrow and already very busy with existing housing. Would be very dangerous with additional vehicles that come with more houses . Too many cars and insufficient access. My</p>	<p>Comments relating to coalescence, green belt and accessibility issues for sites 559830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
45876001	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>59830 Borough Green Gardens , this is Greenbelt and is an AONB, there are traffic issues with the current inhabitants with the addition of 3,000 homes and all the extra traffic that would generate this will create even bigger issues environmentally and otherwise, the road infrastructure will not be able to cope.,. If this site goes ahead what is currently a rural village will become a town larger than Tonbridge 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, the current users of this site are already encroaching illegally and creating traffic issues with heavy lorries and workers parking along residential streets blocking residents. BG and Wrotham are separate villages and this development would merge all into one large Town. 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham OBJECTION : Existing use essential 59492 Western Rd carpark – there is already a shortage of parking, where will all the additional traffic park ? 58492 Station Carpark – already a shortage of parking, current users area already parking in residential streets creating problems for homeowners. 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation. OBJECTION : Greenbelt 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing NO OBJECTIONS 59732 - Novello - Historic landfill</p>	<p>Comments relating to coalescence, green belt and accessibility issues for sites 559830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

59830 Borough Green Gardens, Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic, separates Borough Green from Wrotham. If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge. Conditions applied to large developments requiring 'X' numbers of houses to be constructed and occupied ahead of suitable road/infrastructure put in place - frequently a 'coach & horses' can be driven through conditions such as this. It is my very firm belief that infrastructure goes in at the beginning to ensure that no extra traffic is carried on A25/A227.

59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham
 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt
 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham

I would emphasise the importance of maintaining the green wedges between the settlements of Borough Green/Ightham/Wrotham and St Mary's Platt

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877 and 59767 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45876193

Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

OBJECTION: Existing use essential
 OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements:
 59830 Borough Green Gardens, Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic, separates Borough Green from Wrotham. If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge
 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham
 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt
 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham
 OBJECTION : Existing use essential
 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking
 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking
 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation.

45876705

Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and Stansted

OBJECTION : Greenbelt
 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house
 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing
 NO OBJECTIONS

Comments relating to coalescence, green belt and accessibility issues for sites 59830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45876705	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>OBJECTIONS: Coalescence of Settlements: 59830 Borough Green Gardens , Greenbelt, AONB, won't address traffic issues because so many houses will generate extra traffic , separates Borough Green from Wrotham . If this site goes ahead, our rural villages will become suburbs of a town bigger than Tonbridge 59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham 59843 Crouch Lane, 59748 Dryland Rd, Both these are greenbelt, and separate Borough Green from Platt 59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and separate Borough Green From Ightham OBJECTION : Existing use essential 59492 Western Rd carpark - shortage of parking 58492 Station Carpark - shortage of parking 59849 Crowhill Green - residents green space and recreation. OBJECTION : Greenbelt 59877 - Greenbelt - Important avenue of historic Lime trees leading to historic house 59767 - Greenbelt - TMBC have already rejected this site for housing NO OBJECTIONS 59732 - Novello - Historic landfill I wish to have my say on what is being proposed.</p> <p>1. Building 839 homes per annum is unrealistic especially when other areas will be attempting to build homes at the same time. Tried getting a builder recently?</p> <p>2. Para 4.2.2 says "Land can only be removed from the Green Belt where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated". Spatial strategies 1 and 2 will not require land to be removed from the Green Belt so making site 59608 unnecessary.</p> <p>3. Access to Site 59608 is along very very narrow lanes. The plan says nothing about how construction traffic will access the site. Lorries in Ismays Road will be at best impractical.</p>	Comments relating to coalescence, green belt and accessibility issues for sites 559830, 59712, 59843, 59720, 59492, 59849, 59877, 59767, 59732 and 59829 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
45884993	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>4. Infrastructure Para 5.3.38 says "the council will endeavour to engage and work closely with the various providers of infrastructure to ensure that the sites that come forward are planned for in a sustainable way."Bold words but</p>	Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

The proposed developments would impact our villages in numerous ways, some of which I can outline below:

1. Loss of the MGB
2. Harmful development in an AONB
3. Increased traffic through the village of Ightham and Ivy Hatch, on the A227, the A25 and on country lanes
4. Loss of the 'green wedge' between Ightham and Borough Green
5. Impact of overdevelopment on the historic village of Ightham

42468289
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

6. Ightham and Borough Green will be adversely impacted should the hugely disproportionate development of Borough Green Gardens go ahead [SITE REF: 59608]

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

42468289
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

59608 Ismays Road - absolutely not! This country lane does not allow 2 vehicles to pass let alone the construction vehicles needed to build 37 [SITE REFS: 59881, 59707 AND 59731]

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

As a resident of Wrotham I am writing to express a number of concerns around the proposed plans for Wrotham, Platt and Borough Green. Specifically 59830, 59881 & 59707/59731.

Residents in these areas chose to live here due to its status as an area of outstanding beauty. We accept poor services and rubbish public transport in return for green fields These aren't brownfield sites, you are proposing building housing estates on agricultural, greenfield land. Housing should not be a priority over the environment.

Already many local lanes, including Kemsing road, are becoming increasingly busy and dangerous as they're used as 'rat runs' - due to local roads being overcrowded. Traffic is already horrendous at peak times. If you doubt this visit our villages and see for yourselves.

The M20 is struggling during peak times and junction 3 features daily on traffic news as a hot spot. We don't have the infrastructure to cope with such an increase in housing. Major changes would be required, no doubt leading to further building on fields and woodlands.

Our doctors surgery and local hospitals currently have huge waiting Lists. I haven't seen any commitment of real term budget increases to our local services to cope with additional people.

Your plans would have serious long term negative impact to our villages and

45908097
Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

Comments relating to sites 59881, 59707 and 59731 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

- * Borough Green Garden Village (59830)
- * Gracelands (59720)
- * Gracelands (59871)
- * Ismays Road (59608)
- * Rectory Lane (59770)
- * Darkhill Farm (59709)
- * Borough Green Road (59793)
- * Ightham Bypass (59872)

Dear Sir,

Here is my submission to the Consultation – alongside my husband, I object to the proposed developments at Ightham and Borough Green on a number of grounds, principally:

* Ightham and Ivy Hatch both sit within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – many of the developments around Borough Green and Ightham will result in the permanent loss of this green belt land and will fundamentally change the character of the villages and the AONB countryside – I fail to see what point there is in having these protections and designations if they can be disregarded by property developers and the District Council

* The A25 and A227 are already extremely busy and the additional traffic that will be generated by these new developments will put further pressure on local roads and infrastructure with no additional improvements planned (apart from what is essentially an access road to the Borough Green Garden I am emailing to object against the plan to build on green belt land and the development on our beautiful countryside that is slowly disappearing.

I am also very concerned for the wildlife in this area and have recently witnessed kites flying over that part of Ightham, which I have never seen in 30 years of living in this village.

I understand we need more housing but once this area is developed on it would have a direct impact on the environment and I feel this would just create a negative balance to the fields and woodland in this area.

I 100% object to the development of Borough Green gardens and would be grateful if you would pass this email on to the appropriate parties.

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59720, 59871, 59608, 59770, 59709, 59793 and 59872 noted, including in relation to Green Belt and infrastructure issues. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment noted.

45876257

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42520417

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42356033	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>Having attended the Local plan meeting this week at Ightham I've found the following issues.</p> <p>It's a major concern to everyone that resides in Borough green, Wrotham, Ightham and Platt that infrastructure for any planned building of housing in our local area isn't aligned with KCC. The chairman of Tonbridge and Malling Council explained tonight that planning for infrastructure i.e. roads, rail, power, water both fresh and waste won't be upgraded to allow for any extra housing planned as this is down to KCC</p> <p>We all know that houses need to be built to allow for ever growing capacity locally and throughout the country. It's incredible to hear that KCC and the local plan aren't working together "this is outrageous". For many years our local councillors have been working with government and local government to request the Borough Green Bypass and the J5 slips http://www.j5-slips.org however it was made abundantly clear this isn't likely to happen even if large scale building of new houses happens in our local area. This we were told is down to KCC only!</p> <p>Having reviewed the local plan questionnaire on the local government website it's very clear this has been designed to be as difficult as possible for people to reply to. Can you confirm that the results from the local plan</p>	<p>Comments relating to the area and infrastructure noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.</p>
42356033	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>questionnaire will be published as there's a huge amount of people that just can't complete this document.</p> <p>Please send me the link to the online survey regarding housing in Tonbridge and Malling.</p> <p>It's very disappointing to receive this letter after the stress over the last few years thinking we're going to have our green belt destroyed around us. The local plan for this area is a disgrace and any party or MP backing this will surely lose their seat at the next general election.</p> <p>Borough Green and Wrotham for more than 20 years have been fighting to reduce pollution and speeding on our roads, I'm so worried being a conservative voter that the local destruction of our village will happen under your tenor, Anti social behaviour in the village is at an all time high with drug dealing taking place daily in local park areas. The thought of adding another 6000 people to this small village is beyond worrying more like madness. You're basically going to destroy village life for all residents.</p> <p>[SITE REFS: 59712, 59720 AND 59709]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement.</p>
45945697	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and 0 Stansted	<p>59712 Oaktrees Greenbelt AONB, already encroaching illegally, separates BG from Wrotham</p> <p>59720 Gracelands, 59709 Darkhill. Both sites are Greenbelt AONB, and</p>	<p>Comments relating to site 59712 59720 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

[Sites 59709, 59830, 59843 and 59748]

We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

So I OBJECT to Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens

We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded area and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just to line developer's pockets.

We also need to prevent development on site 59709, 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between our villages and have a crucial amenity value.

This area is groaning under its overpopulation already, any more and we will grind to a halt. Remember levelling up - build them up North.
[Sites 59720, 59608, 59709]

I have been aware of recent house building applications within the Borough and Parish of Ightham. As a 20-year resident I'm writing to offer my comments on these

Recent meetings on Borough Green Garden City have highlighted many issues with this proposal. I for one would be deeply affected as to living on Bates Hill. This road over the 20 years has seen dramatic increase in use and especially haulage. My property is 100 years plus of age and is continually vibrating. The application I understand is based on a relief road that takes no account of traffic travelling out towards Tonbridge... which is a major school provider to the area. 3000 houses would increase... it's a 40% plus growth on the area without provision of infrastructure

Along with this proposal I've looked into Gracelands 59720 with 198; Ismays Road 59608 with 37; Gracelands additional 28; and Dark Hill with undisclosed use.

All of these cannot proceed without the destroying of green belt... Ightham is

Comments relating to sites 59709, 59830, 59843 and 59748 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59870, 59608 and 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

45987905

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

45988001

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

45988161

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

I wish to object to ANY development in Ightham/Borough Green.
Specifically 59720 59871 59709 59770 59608 59793 59872 and finally 59830
Borough Green Gardens.
This is Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
There should be no thought to touch this land for development. There are
plenty of areas in the TMBC boundaries which do not have these valuable
features.
Construction would be significantly disruptive and noise, fumes and light
pollution would destroy quality of life. Ecological destruction would have
long term effects on wildlife dependent on these oases .
The "Mixed" developments are a significant threat which would exacerbate
the smoke, lights, traffic and noise of H+H Celcon multifold.
The infrastructure, particularly road network is not coping now.
Although I pass 59720 59871 59709 59770 59608 59793 59872 daily and
wholly object to their development, 59830 is an unimaginably inappropriate
disproportionate development in such a valuable environment.
The destruction of our villages from within is also appalling, as attached [a
number of documents were attached relating to planning application
22/00518/FL, including: neighbour comments, delegated report and
proposed site street scene and elevations plans] . I have appealed against
this individual development but have had no reply.
I attended the Ightham Local Planning meeting last week. I was pleased to
hear the statements about not permitting development in AONB, avoiding
construction on Green Belt and not allowing inappropriate buildings.
I was dismayed at the end of the meeting to be informed by Ightham Parish
Council that a development at the end of my garden had been approved by
TMBC, despite local and Parish Council objections. Sadly the meeting had

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608,
59793, 59872, and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be
taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection
processes.

		<p>-----</p> <p>We should like to register three main comments on the Local Plan, particularly as they affect Wrotham.</p> <p>First, a general view of sustainability and quality of village life. If you drive, walk or cycle from Borough Green to Wrotham village along the A227, you cross the M26 and turn left into Borough Green Road. Ahead is a sign: Wrotham in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. At other points, Wrotham is signed as 'historic' which it surely must be, if only because it has an extensive entry in the 1086 Domesday Book. This old village, with its grade 1 listed Church, has expanded over the years, but remains a distinctive rural village set in green belt and AONB land, though it struggles to do so with various commercial activities growing on the A227 and A20 nearby (please see note 1). Despite this, it remains a village on the tourist map, and attracts walkers and cyclists in numbers. The Local Plan contains sites for development which, if implemented, would erode if not completely erase the character of Wrotham's village life. Instead of being located in the Kent Downs, Wrotham village would effectively become part of an urban sprawl, with major negative implications for the quality of life of those now living there, and for those thinking of visiting it. Moreover, the distinctive separation of Wrotham, Platt and Ightham villages would simply disappear.</p> <p>Second, the most obvious negative effect of the Local Plan on Wrotham would be on its traffic levels, already a major problem for the village and surrounding area. Building several hundred homes here, would mean hundreds more cars and vans driving in and around the village, both by the new home owners, and those delivering various services to them. The major bottleneck of the Whitehill roundabout, which currently causes major problems of queuing, pollution and accident risk would become considerably worse.</p> <p>I would like to support the adoption of the plan that is for development in Urban areas. There is enough space to be able to do this especially if brownfield is used as well as extending these areas.</p> <p>As a second option rural service centres EXCEPT any development on Greenbelt</p> <p>Greenbelt and AONB was set up to stop development from sprawling centres of development and if we start now this is just the thin end of the wedge. No development justifies a higher priority than keeping this greenbelt policy in place</p> <p>Specifically around the BART villages (Birling, Addington, Ryash, Trottiscliffe) the following need to be protected</p> <p>Site 59610 Residential: Park Road Addington Site 59628 Residential: Millhouse Lane Addington Site 59725 Residential: Ford Lane Site 59730 Residential: Addington Lane Trottiscliffe</p>	
46058849	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and O Stansted		Comments relating to the role and historic nature of Wrotham noted. Comments relating to sites 59881, 59880, 59707 and 59731 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.
46061857	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ightham and O Stansted		Comments relating to sites 59610, 59628, 59725, 59730, 59736, 59850 and 59812 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Please find below our representation to the TMBC Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation. This representation objects to the proposed allocation of Land to east of Ismays Road, Ivy Hatch (Site 59608) for residential development.

Conclusion

The Site is located outside of any settlement boundary and within a Rural Area in part of the countryside designated as Green Belt. The Site is in existing agricultural use. It is not brownfield or previously developed land and therefore its allocation for residential development would, by definition, be inappropriate. The Site is also located within the AONB and allocation of the Site would result in significant negative effects to a landscape of scenic beauty which the Government affords the highest status of protection to.

The Site is poorly accessible and not located near to schools, facilities or amenities that are important for health and well-being. As existing, the Site contributes to employment and economic growth which would be lost. The Site is sensitively located within an Archaeological Priority Area and near to designated heritage assets of national importance. The Site is also located over a Source Protection Zone and effects on water features and resources are unknown. The Site is not served by public transport and would not encourage walking or cycling. Occupiers of any future development would be dependent on use of a private car which would be in direct conflict with objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and minimise climate change.

In summary, the NPPF requires plans to provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to share their surroundings. It requires plans to be prepared with the

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

46064257

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

Please find below my representation to the TMBC Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation. This representation objects to the proposed allocation of Land to east of Ismays Road, Ivy Hatch (Site 59608) for residential development. I am strongly objecting to the proposed allocation of this site for residential development.

Conclusion

The Site is located outside of any settlement boundary and within a Rural Area in part of the countryside designated as Green Belt. The Site is in existing agricultural use. It is not brownfield or previously developed land and therefore its allocation for residential development would, by definition, be inappropriate. The Site is also located within the AONB and allocation of the Site would result in significant negative effects to a landscape of scenic beauty which the Government affords the highest status of protection to.

The Site is poorly accessible and not located near to schools, facilities or amenities that are important for health and well-being. As existing, the Site contributes to employment and economic growth which would be lost. The Site is sensitively located within an Archaeological Priority Area and near to designated heritage assets of national importance. The Site is also located over a Source Protection Zone and effects on water features and resources are unknown. The Site is not served by public transport and would not encourage walking or cycling. Occupiers of any future development would be dependent on use of a private car which would be in direct conflict with objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and minimise climate change. [59731, 59707, 59881, 59880, 59665, 59720, 59681, 59871, 59712, 59705, 59680, 59788, 59770, 59709]

As below, in response to your local plan "call for sites" Regulation 18 consultation, I am against building on our countryside Greenbelt and any impact on our rare and fragile Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Greenbelt and AONB must be protected.

Here is my submission to the consultation with reference to specific sites and

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59731, 59707, 59881, 59880, 59665, 59720, 59681, 59871, 59712, 59705, 59680, 59788, 59770 and 59709 noted . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

46064513

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

46064929

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

 The Local Plan consultation has skewed questions steering answers towards agreement to planning. I object to this bias and, therefore, need to email my objection. The Consultation restricts accessibility for most people especially the elderly of the area. In addition, it is far too long and over complicated. I am shocked at the lack of quality in the Local Plan. It is not Local and there is no detail. I have attempted to answer as many questions of the consultation and chosen to write an email with the following objections;

We moved to Ightham having searched for two years whilst working hard to save for a house in a desirable village in Kent. It is very disappointing to find the chosen rural area may become urban.

* Although there has been opportunity to be consulted I have very little say or power. The concept of the titled 'Local Plan' is not for the locals and neither is it local as it covers too large an area.

* The development will spoil the local villages, their appeal and historical charm. The area is tree lined, wooded and protected. It is remote and this is demonstrated by the local story that soldiers could not find Ightham Mote when King Henry VIII was there 500 years ago.

* I run daily on the local lanes and I see an elderly lady on a zimmer frame enjoying the outdoors and the peace and quiet of the area. She likes to say a few words as I pass by. I dread the thought of this lady losing her moments of pleasure because of the Local Plan.

* Increased traffic will spoil the aesthetic appeal of quiet country lanes. Most lanes like Rectory Lane, Ismays Road, Sandy Lane and Common Road are not
 * The site list details are not complete. It does not list types of housing, tenures or sizes.

* The development will cause light pollution. Currently there is very little light pollution. Ightham does not have street lights and we want to keep it that way.* Lack of capacity at local schools is an issue.* Huge impact on landscape and views.* Negative impact on animal habitat – for example, rabbits at Celcon. In the plan it says the layout of development will not mitigate any adverse affects but it will! It is within '500m of AONBs', Heritage asset within 250m away – it is not named but I assume it is Oldbury Hill.* Flood zone 3? What is Flood zone 3? This whole area is on the down slope from the watershed on the North Downs and has the River Bourne and numerous streams and ponds. There must be a possible threat to flooding. * Currently there are lovely rolling fields along the North Downs Way right up to the A25. This will spoil the landscape and its history.* There will be increased gas emissions already a problem in London. Threat to reduce the air quality. Currently it states that it is not within 100m of an AQMA but in 10

Comment noted. Consultation outcomes and responses will be used to support drafting of the local plan, and reported through the consultation statement. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

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

46101729

Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

46101729

Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

[Site reference 59709]

* Dark Hill 59709 concerns..

* The proposal is mixed use tbc? Again, how can we comment?!

* States it is within existing healthcare 800m – This is already at capacity! I cannot get an appointment.

* The current local area and open space is perfect for walking, running and cycling. This is an existing amenity and can only be spoilt by development. Increased traffic and people will spoil what we have and enjoy about the area.

* New schools will cause more congestion on local roads at capacity.

* Appropriate mitigation? The best mitigation is to leave it alone. May avoid adverse affects on biodiversity and geodiversity. How can the effects of building not impact on the landscape. Notes say this will depend on the design, scale and layout of the development. How can this be commented if plans are not detailed and outlined. Any developments will have a negative impact on the landscape which is currently tree lined and rolling green fields.

* Again this site is 250m from a heritage site - can it not be named!!!! It will be spoilt by development so close by.

[Site reference 59720 and 59871]

* Gracelands 59720 and 59871 concerns...- who is the housing for? Why does it mention schools? I have heard it may be retirement homes. What is the proposed land use?

* The Cultural and Heritage sites do not need enhancing they need protecting in Law.

* The lines of sight from the hills will be spoilt a loss of aesthetic quality.

* Flood zone 1? What is it? Surely you are not proposing building an area liable to flooding?

* How does a railway station 800m away but you can't walk down the A25 as it is too dangerous! You have to travel by car or bus.

* On the details it states 100 dwellings or more? Ightham Parish Council notes say it will be 198. This is double! Urgent need for clarity.

* It states there will be a Mix of housing - including affordable housing - greater contribution to local housing needs. Do we need houses here - NO!

* I have written objections about three sites but generically the objection applies to all of them. Sevenoaks Chronicle published a charming article this summer on Ightham saying it is the best place in UK to live in Kent.

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

46101729

Comment relating to site 59709 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

46101729

Comments relating to site 59720 and 59871 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

To whom it my concern,
 We write further to the information received from Ightham Parish Council regarding The Local Plan (Regulation 18) - Consultation (Deadline 3 November 2022).

We have not had time to review the full plan in detail - there is a vast amount of information on the specific TMBC website. However, as residents of Ightham for 25 years we are extremely concerned about the impact these proposals will have.

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty & Metropolitan Green Belt - This Must Be Respected & Protected

Ightham (and Ivy Hatch) sit within the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). We moved into this area because of the natural surroundings and beautiful countryside. The purpose of the MGB is to protect the countryside and prevent urban sprawl; these areas are specifically designated as MGB & AONB to do just that. They have been recognised and catagorised for their Outstanding Natural Beauty. We all have a responsibility to do all we can to protect these Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty for the generations to come. It is incumbent upon us all to do so. As soon as we begin to develop these areas, they will no longer be Natural by definition - we will be destroying it and preventing those who come after us from enjoying these areas as we and those before us have done. Once these green areas are developed, they will be lost forever and the environment damaged beyond repair in the process.

Inadequate Road Network

It is clear that the local area is already overloaded and cannot support new housing. The A25 from Wrotham to Riverhead (and beyond) is overloaded and gridlocked for much of the day including weekends. The expansion of [Site reference number 59830]

[Detailed comments relating to this and other sites within other representation against Wrotham ward]

46102657

Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871,59709, 59770, 59793, 59872 and 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

46102657

Table 9 - List of Sites -
 Wrotham, Ighthan and
 O Stansted

* Borough Green Garden City 59830

Comment relating to site 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42773761	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>I would like to register my strong objection to the following potential Ightham sites as part of the TMBC Local Plan:</p> <p>59720 59608 59871 59709 59872 59770 59830</p> <p>My objections are based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of the Metropolitan Green Belt * Harmful development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty * Increased traffic through the historic village of Ightham on the A227, the A25 and surrounding country lanes * Loss of the "green wedge" between Ightham and Borough Green * Impact of overdevelopment of our historic village * How Ightham and Borough Green will be adversely impacted should the hugely disproportionate development of Borough Green Gardens go ahead <p>I would like to register my strong objection to the following potential Ightham sites as part of the TMBC Local Plan:</p>	<p>Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59709, 59872, 59770 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>
42773825	Table 9 - List of Sites - Wrotham, Ighthan and O Stansted	<p>59720</p> <p>59608</p> <p>59871</p> <p>59709</p> <p>59872</p> <p>59770</p> <p>59830</p> <p>My objections are based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of the Metropolitan Green Belt * Harmful development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty * Increased traffic through the historic village of Ightham on the A227, the A25 and surrounding country lanes * Loss of the "green wedge" between Ightham and Borough Green * Impact of overdevelopment of our historic village * How Ightham and Borough Green will be adversely impacted should the hugely disproportionate development of Borough Green Gardens go ahead 	<p>Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59709, 59872, 59770 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.</p>

I would like to register my strong objection to the following potential Ightham sites as part of the TMBC Local Plan:

59720

59608

59871

59709

59872

59770

59830

My objections are based on the following reasons:

- * Loss of the Metropolitan Green Belt
- * Harmful development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- * Increased traffic through the historic village of Ightham on the A227, the A25 and surrounding country lanes
- * Loss of the "green wedge" between Ightham and Borough Green
- * Impact of overdevelopment of our historic village
- * How Ightham and Borough Green will be adversely impacted should the hugely disproportionate development of Borough Green Gardens go ahead

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59709, 59872, 59770 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

46108961

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

I write to provide comments on the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and in particular, the proposal to build up to 37 residential dwellings in Ivy Hatch on site 59608 (CfS Ref: 322c0e / postcode TN15 0NY).

I am pleased to have been consulted at this early stage on how our community should develop and the areas where new housing should be built to tackle the important issue of providing affordable housing at least cost to the local environment, whilst protecting the greenbelt (including the metropolitan greenbelt) and historic environment. It is important that this new housing is built in close proximity to pre-existing infrastructure which is capable of being extended to meet new demand where required, so that it does not compromise the quality and scope of the existing facilities.

With these points in mind, I was surprised and disappointed to see that site 59608 which is situated in an area of outstanding natural beauty and accessed off a quiet single-track country lane within a quaint and historic community, is being considered for residential development. The Local Plan foresees that up to 37 residential dwellings could be built on this land. To illustrate the scale of this project in context, if built, the development would comprise more houses than are currently accessible across the entire length of the proposed access road (Ismays Road) which is over a mile long.

The relevant site is situated in the metropolitan greenbelt and is within an area of outstanding natural beauty. The precise purpose of the metropolitan greenbelt is, among other things, (i) to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; (ii) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from

Please note that I object to development on the Green Belt or in the AONB anywhere in Ightham Parish.

Comments relating to sites 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comment noted.

46116737

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

42557761

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608, 59793, 59872, 59830 .

I wish to comment on the Ightham potential sites as proposed on the Local Plan. These proposed sites start at the edge of Borough Green and continue to line the A25 toward Old Lane, Ightham. I believe that development here will have a detrimental affect on the nature of Ightham village, on the traffic along the A25, and harm the area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Currently there is a distinct separation between the villages of Borough Green and Ightham, namely the fields and open space along the A25. Should the above development/s be approved there will ultimately be a continuous urban sprawl stretching from the eastern edge of St. Mary's Platt, through Borough Green linking the village of Ightham to this. I believe this ribbon development will urbanize Ightham, making it indistinguishable with Borough Green and it's village appeal will be lost.

The knock-on effect of traffic on A25 will be substantial. Today the road cannot cope with the levels of traffic at rush hour with the A25 into Seal a huge bottle neck. Ditto from the roundabout at Ightham bypass into Borough Green. Hundreds more houses will clearly put a massive strain on the road. The back lanes to Sevenoaks are already dangerous rat runs for people trying to avoid the resulting queues of traffic. With this increased traffic will be [59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59707, 59872, 59770, 59794]

I wish to formally register my opposition of local plan regulation 18. I am a resident of Ightham and strongly oppose the plans under consultation for the development of large volumes of housing in and around our beautiful historic village. The local residents are incredibly proud and respectful of the history of the village and yet these crass plans are being made with no regard for the preservation of the wonderful area.

My main concerns over the impact on the village are:

- the loss of our metropolitan green belt: specifically classified to protect the area from development and preserve the stunning countryside
- the serious development of thousands of houses in the Kent downs area of natural beauty. Again, the status of the area has been classified to mark the natural beauty of the area; this will absolutely be devastated if the plans go ahead
- untenable strain on the infrastructure of the area, both in terms of the increased traffic on already very busy roads (a227 and a25) and on the local services
- a loss of the green spaces around the village that are currently enjoyed by the villagers and by visitors to the area
- the impact on the small villages of Ightham and borough green will be hugely disproportionate. The villages will be completely drowned by the new dwellings proposed and the area would be unrecognizable

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59871, 59709, 59770, 59608, 59793, 59872 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59608, 59871, 59793, 59707, 59872, 59770 and 59794 noted, including comments relating to the Green Belt and infrastructure. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

42832993

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

46128001

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ighthan and
O Stansted

Commenting on Individual Sites. As you can see from the green area to the left, most of Wrotham is covered by the AONB designation. If you are commenting on a particular site around Wrotham the above list tells you whether AONB or 'AONB Setting' applies. All of Wrotham Parish is green belt apart from the village itself. 'AONB Setting' means development would be so close to the AONB as to impact on views that the AONB seeks to protect. Many of you will recognise in the list above, land around the village that has been put forward for development. Just because a landowner has aspirations to get rich, doesn't mean that land will be developed. In most cases just saying that 'the site is within the green belt and North Downs AONB and as such is heavily constrained against development in planning terms', will be enough. My only qualification is that there must be some housing for young families and the Old Allotment Site (59751) which is already designated for development by the previous plan may not be enough.

Borough Green Gardens (59830) is another matter by virtue of it being so huge that it will cause the villages of Wrotham Heath, Platt, Borough Green and north Ightham to coalesce into one urban town, by virtue of the extra 3,000 dwellings.

Road junctions are already over loaded, slow traffic creates air pollution that particularly affects children in terms of asthma and other respiratory illnesses. The concept of trying to build on five active quarries, all at different stages of quarrying, also requiring a road built across all of them early doors, makes this site a very risky strategy for TMBC. Planning Inspectors have failed one TMBC Local Plan already and at great loss of our Council Tax. To [Sites 59830, 59709 59843, and 59748]

Site 59830 Borough Green Gardens

We are a group of small rural villages. This proposal will turn our villages into suburbs of a large town bigger than Tonbridge itself. There are enough areas of land in TMBC to build on if you want to, without destroying our precious Greenbelt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

We accept we need more housing for refugees and getting young people on the property ladder, we do not need houses to attract people into this overcrowded area and who are moving out of perfectly good houses elsewhere. The whole point of this avalanche of house building is to provide homes for a growing population, not just line developer's pockets.

We also need to prevent development on site 59709 59843, and 59748, these greenbelt open spaces maintain the separation between our villages and have a crucial amenity value.

Comments relating to the the positioning of Wrotham and the AONB noted. Comments relating to sites 59751 and 59830 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

Comments relating to sites 59830, 59709 59843 and 59748 noted, including that in relation to the role of the villages . The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

46163713

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

46207201

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
O Stansted

59720 Gracelands,* OBJECT

* Site is on MGB and in an AONB. The village of Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of MGB is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl.

* Development will mean loss of green wedge between Borough Green and Ightham impacting the individual identity of our villages.

* Proposed development will result in overdevelopment on Ightham historic village.

59709 Darkhill Farm

* OBJECT

* Site is on MGB and in an AONB. The village of Ightham sits within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The purpose of MGB is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl.

* Development will mean loss of green wedge between Borough Green and Ightham impacting the individual identity of our villages.

* Proposed development will result in overdevelopment on Ightham historic village.

59608 Ismays road

* OBJECT

Table 9 - List of Sites -
Wrotham, Ightham and
Stansted

Comments relating to sites 59720, 59709, 59608 noted. The site specific matters raised will be taken into consideration within the site analysis and site selection processes.

25406401